William L. Holder:

35P

Ron Smith
Wesleyan
203946

LESSONS ON THE WAY

THE FORMER VOLUMES

Volume I. THE CHRISTIAN COVENANT.

Preface.
A Specimen Page of Notes.
1. Now to Take Notes.
2. Introductory Lesson.
3. The Christian Name.
4. The Covenant.
5. The Twin Doctrines.
6. A Member of Christ.
7. The Child of God.
8. An Inheritance.
9. The Kingdom of Heaven (I.).
10. The Kingdom of Heaven (II.).
11. The Kingdom of Heaven (III.).
12. The Kingdom of Heaven (IV.).
13. A Revision.
14. A Lesson in Loyalty.
15. The Devil.
16. The Problem of Evil.
17. The Problem of Pain (I.).
18. The Problem of Pain (II.).
19. The Works of the Devil.
20. This Wicked World (I.).
21. This Wicked World (II.).
22. Pomps.
23. Vanity.
24. The Lusts of the Flesh.
25. Conversion.
26. Right Belief.
27. God's Holy Will.
28. Responsibility.
29. This State of Salvation.
30. Revision on the Covenant.

Volume II. BELIEF IN GOD AND IN JESUS CHRIST.

Preface.
31. The Need of a Creed.
32. A Simple Creed.
33. Belief, Faith, and Trust.
34. Belief in the Unseen.
35. "I Believe In."
36. The Personality of God.
37. The Trinity.
38. The Fatherhood of God.
39. God is Quite Good.
40. "Almighty."
41. A Revision.
42. Maker. 1. Creation.
43. Maker. 2. Immanence.
44. Maker of Water.
45. "Of Heaven and Earth."
46. "All Things Visible and Invisible."
47. Thought and Expression.
48. Creative Thought.
49. What is Christianity?
50. "And in Jesus."
51. The Man Christ Jesus.
52. Humanity and Divinity
53. The Divinity of Christ.
54. Christ.
55. His Only Son.
56. Our Lord.
57. The Birth of Christ.
58. The Death of Christ.
59. After Death.
60. The Gospel of Christ.

Volumes I. and II. are published by the S.P.C.K.

Volume IV. will be CHRISTIAN MORALS.

Volume V. will be CHRISTIAN PRAYER AND SACRAMENTS.

By the Same Author

THE PARSON'S HANDBOOK. Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d.

BODY AND SOUL: The Effect of Religion upon Health. Mowbrays. 3s. 6d.

FALSE GODS: An Enquiry into the Object of Religion. Mowbrays. 5s.

THE POWER OF THE SPIRIT. Page Lectures, U.S.A. Oxford University Press. 3s. 6d.

THE ART OF PUBLIC WORSHIP. Bohlen Lectures, U.S.A. Mowbrays. 5s.

THE ENGLISH LITURGY, with Additional Matter (with Bishop S. M. Taylor and Bishop W. H. Frere). Rivingtons. Three guineas.

THE SANCTUARY: A Book of Prayers. Rivingtons. 1s., etc.

EVERY MAN'S HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH, AND OF THE PRAYER BOOK. Mowbrays. 2s. 6d. each.

SONG TIME: Nursery Rhymes and Children's Hymns (with Martin Shaw). Curwen. 4s. 6d.

THE ENGLISH CAROL BOOK, Vols. I. and II. (with Martin Shaw). Mowbrays. 3s. 6d. each.

THE CHURCH AT PRAYER AND THE WORLD OUTSIDE. James Clarke. 5s.

ART AND RELIGION. Student Christian Movement. Paper 2s., Cloth 3s. 6d.

THE RESURRECTION, THE SPIRIT, AND THE CHURCH

London Agents:
Simpkin Marshall Ltd.

THE RESURRECTION, THE SPIRIT, AND THE CHURCH

BY

PERCY DEARMER, D.D.

Professor and Lecturer, King's College, University of London

VOL. III.

OF

LESSONS ON THE WAY

FOR THE USE OF
ENQUIRERS AND TEACHERS

CAMBRIDGE
W. HEFFER & SONS LTD
1928

First Published in 1923
New Edition - 1928

PRINTED IN ENGLAND.

Preface to Volume III.

It is so important for books about religion to be as well printed and set up as those about other subjects, that I am glad to draw attention to the improvement of style in this, the third volume of *Lessons on the Way*. The reader is referred to the former prefaces for general information as to the series; but it may be as well here to mention a few points.

Lessons on the Way is an attempt to state a coherent theology in simple terms, to explain point by point what an intelligent Christian ought to know about his religion, to set forth that religion in the light of the knowledge which the world has acquired up to the present year of grace. A difficult and perhaps a too ambitious attempt! but it has to be made if we are to have any right to teach; and the task is less disconcerting when it is not framed in a book of professional theology, but has been worked out year by year during a quarter of a century of teaching. Even then, the result cannot but be full of faults; but the writer may claim that he has tried to avoid that habit of special pleading, of slurring over difficult matters, of stating what seems to be expected of him, whether he honestly believes it or not, which is a peculiar temptation in teaching.

The Lessons are written with intelligent young people in mind; but they have also been found useful for adults, and even for subjects of discussion in adult study classes. The audience immediately in view has been the upper classes of a secondary school. For younger or less educated people, a certain amount of expansion may be needed, and in many cases one Lesson will become two, or even more. Expansion, rather than mere simplification or omission, would be needed for the very young, who often understand much more than they are given credit for, and can be interested in most subjects, if the Teacher knows his craft. He will then

himself digest any text-book he uses; and, having made the subject his own, will propound it in his own way.

The few abbreviations hardly need explanation. Three dots are a suggestion for the Teacher (who is familiarly called "T") to throw out a question. "L" refers to other Lessons; and, as there are thirty Lessons in each Volume, Lessons 1 to 30 are in Volume I., Lessons 31 to 60 in Volume II., and 61 to 90 in the present Volume. The Teacher is supposed to use a blackboard, and therefore new words are not avoided: it is absolutely necessary for the audience to understand the meaning of a few new words, if they are to have an intelligent grasp of Christianity to-day.

The subject-matter of Volumes II. and III. is the most difficult of the series, and also the most controversial; but it cannot be shirked for that reason. We cannot expect everyone to agree on matters over which our forefathers fought with cruel bitterness; we cannot hope to be always free from prejudice, but we can always remember that God is truth and is charity; and we can be sure of getting nearer to the truth (and therefore further from lies—a point that is often forgotten) if we are very candid and very charitable.

The Fourth Volume will be easier; its subject will be Christian Morals, in the Duties to God and our Neighbour: the last, Volume V., will be, it is hoped, on Prayer and the Sacraments.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	PREFACE	vii
61.	THE RESURRECTION (I.)	1
62.	THE RESURRECTION (II.)	6
63.	THE RESURRECTION (III.)	11
64.	THE RESURRECTION (IV.)	17
65.	THE ASCENSION	23
66.	IN HEAVEN	28
67.	JUDGEMENT	33
68.	THE GOOD SHEPHERD	40
69.	THE HOLY SPIRIT	47
70.	THE PARACLETE	52
71.	PENTECOST	57
72.	THE POWER OF THE SPIRIT	62
73.	SPECIAL GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT	68
74.	THE SIX GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT	74
75.	THE FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT	80
76.	WHAT IS THE CHURCH?	86
77.	DIVISIONS IN THE CHURCH	93
78.	THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH	100
79.	PROPORTION	107
80.	THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH	113
81.	THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND	120

CHAPTER PAGE
82. Oversea Missions 128
83 Apostolic, Holy and Catholic 134
84. The Communion of Saints (I.) 140
85. The Communion of Saints (II.) 145
86. The Communion of Saints (III.) 152
87. The Forgiveness of Sins 158
88. Forgiveness and Repentance 163
89. The Resurrection of the Body . . . 170
90. The Life Everlasting 176

61

THE RESURRECTION

I.—Sunday

This subject is, of course, not an easy one; it involves too many scientific and theological points for that, and subjects about which we are only on the threshold of knowledge. None the less, if the Teacher attempts it at all, he must risk being difficult rather than being inadequate or untruthful. To omit matters of importance altogether is sometimes necessary, but it is not very satisfactory. An average audience will probably gain a very useful general impression of the subjects of the next two Lessons, while a few will understand and remember the whole outline.

ON Good Friday the disciples were in despair. They had given up everything to follow Jesus; they had loved him, adored him, and they had believed in him entirely. And now he had been put to death . . . and buried. Two nights and a day followed: their despair must have grown deeper. Then on Sunday, rumours got abroad that he had been seen walking about. They were too miserable to take much notice of this report at first. But then some of the Apostles saw him, then more, then many others. At last they were all convinced that he had appeared again in this world, that he had communicated with them all from the next world, that they had seen him. He was not dead; he was alive for evermore. The Resurrection had taken place, on this, the first Easter Day. Their despair was turned into certainty. It was upon that certainty that the Christian Church was founded. The first day of every week was kept as a festival, to commemorate the

Resurrection. And that is why we still keep holiday on Sunday, and go to church. Sunday is the . . . first day of the week. The Jews had kept holiday on the last day of the week . . . Saturday. Sunday is a weekly Easter; and itself is evidence that from the beginning the Christian disciples were certain of the Resurrection.

II.—Psychic Science

All things that have to do with the next world are difficult in a way, and at some times they have appeared more difficult than others. To our grandfathers these psychic things (as they are called)—things which have to do with the spiritual life of man—appeared very difficult indeed. This was because scientific men had then discovered many things about the body, but practically nothing about the spirit of man. We have since then discovered many much more wonderful things about the body, and also many things about the spirit—and scientific men are still making discoveries in the science of the body (which is called *physiology*) and in the science of the spirit, or soul (which is called *psychology*). The result is that we no longer consider it impossible that any one should appear from the next world and speak to people in this. Some scientific people even say that they have discovered how a spiritual being in the next world can clothe himself in a very light kind of body, which is like our bodies, but can vanish away again in a moment. This is just such a body as the Gospels tell us that Christ had after the Resurrection. He appeared in a room when the doors were shut; he talked to the disciples and to S. Thomas, and then he vanished away.

III.—The Belief of the Apostles

All these things about the spiritual world which learned people [*especially in the Society for Psychical*

Research] are so carefully investigating and searching for, do seem to fit in extraordinarily well with the accounts of the Resurrection in the Gospels. So that whereas in the time of our grandfathers many clever people thought those accounts could not be true, to-day we are beginning to see that they are extraordinarily right, and just what we ought to expect. It seems that the Apostles, who wrote their accounts quite simply and truthfully, have had to wait nearly 1900 years to be justified—that is, for people to be able to see how true and exact they were.

But there is one thing that we still do not understand. What happened to the body of Christ? The belief of the Apostles, and of the Church, was that it was changed into Christ's new and spiritual body, and therefore that the tomb was empty. I shall assume that this is what happened, because I think, that—as we are finding that the Apostles were right in what they said about Christ's wonderful works, about his healing people, and about his appearing after death to his friends—so we shall find that they were right about his body. But there are some wise and good Christian scholars who do not think thus; they think our Lord's body was buried like any one else's body, and that only his spirit appeared to his disciples: this is contrary to what the Gospels tell us. But even if it were true, the important thing is that Christ did appear to his disciples after his death, and on this all Christian scholars are agreed.

IV.—Physiology

We shall probably find out more in the future. We know already that the body is an infinitely more wonderful and more spiritual thing than our forefathers could imagine. We know, for instance, that an average human body consists of about 25,000 million million cells, and that the average cell, so infinitesimally tiny, contains 1000 million atoms. And each cell is alive!

and each cell does its own special work with complete ability! And I wish I had time to tell you about one of the most recent discoveries—the little messengers which run about the body, like tiny telegraph boys, called *hormones*.

There isn't time. Some day we will have a special lecture. . . . But we don't really know what powers the body may possess with its millions of millions of clever little cells. They have built up one kind of body: they may be able to build up another. There will be further discoveries. Perhaps we shall find that what happens at death is really but a rather clumsy makeshift; and that it is possible under perfect conditions for the cells to transform the body, or, as we say, to *transmute* it. It will then seem most reasonable to suppose that the body of Christ was transmuted into a spiritual body. When water is boiled, it is transformed into vapour; when it is frozen it is transformed into ice. Radium is slowly transmuted into another element, helium; and eventually helium is transmuted into lead.

But I don't want to talk science to you. These great matters need special study. I only want you to realise that we no longer believe in the stability of matter ("the atom has been smashed to atoms"); and that we are beginning to learn something of the power of the spirit over the body. We cannot say that we know very much. We have no right to condemn people who don't agree with us about the details of a mysterious event like the Resurrection, about which we know so little. But we can expect that some day we shall know more. And meanwhile I think that the Apostles were right in saying that the body of Christ was changed into a spiritual body. People naturally have different theories, in these changing times; but, whatever our theory, the fact remains that Jesus appeared many times after his death to his disciples.

Here another T. (if he reads really well) may say:—All this about the body and its cells is expressed very finely in a sonnet by John Masefield. You won't understand

it all, the first time, but you will get the general idea, and you will like the sound of it:—

> If I could get within this changing I,
> This ever altering thing which yet persists,
> Keeping the features it is reckoned by,
> While each component atom breaks or twists;
> If, wandering past strange groups of shifting forms,
> Cells at their hidden marvels hard at work,
> Pale from much toil, or red from sudden storms,
> I might attain to where the Rulers lurk;
> If, pressing past the guards in those grey gates,
> The brain's most folded, intertwisted shell.
> I might attain to that which alters fates.
> The King, the supreme self, the Master Cell;
> Then, on Man's earthly peak, I might behold
> The unearthly self beyond, unguessed, untold.

[*Some such concluding reflection as the following may be useful for older classes.*] To some people everything in the world seems so wonderful, that they expect to find miracles everywhere; and the less they can explain in the life of Christ, the better they like it. They like to think of his birth and his death as miraculous, and so also of all his mighty works of healing, and of his Resurrection. And they don't want you to explain how orderly, and natural, and reasonable everything was. But people who have had a scientific training can't look at things this way; they must have evidence and reasons which seem to them scientific. Both kinds of people—the simple and the scientific, we might call them—are apt to exaggerate their own side. The scientific people often do, and are sometimes narrow-minded. But all the same, if you don't have scientific reasons for things you believe in, such beliefs are in danger of becoming less and less real as you learn more. Some people seem to make the life of Christ into a sort of fairy-tale, and they are so afraid of criticism that one sometimes wonders whether they really believe in it themselves.

So we have to remember both sides; and not to forget that a religion which hopes to convert the whole world must (among other things) be reasonable.

62

THE RESURRECTION

THE EVIDENCE

I.—From Despair to Certainty

CHRISTIANITY would never have been heard of, if the disciples had not been absolutely certain that they had seen Jesus alive after he had been crucified, and that he had appeared to them many times. The work of Christ would have come to a disastrous end on Good Friday. Next week his followers would have gone back to their old work. They would have remembered him in after years, as a beautiful and tragic memory: they would have talked about it all to their children. Some of their grandchildren would have remembered it. By the time of *their* grandchildren it would have been forgotten. No one would have known anything about it in two hundred years time. And what of us? . . . Of course we should never have heard that there had ever been such a person as Jesus Christ.

What happened was just the opposite. The disciples went about with a strange new enthusiasm. "Jesus is risen from the dead," they said. "The Lord is risen indeed." They made speeches to great crowds of people; they preached a new religion, and the foundation of that religion was that Jesus had risen from the dead and was alive for evermore; they converted thousands of people; they made a society of believers, who a little later [*Ac.* 11[26]] came to be called "Christians." They met together every week on the day when he had risen—the . . . first day of the week, or . . . Sunday, and

broke the bread together to commemorate the Resurrection: so the Communion Service was their witness as well as Sunday, and still is to-day. This society of Christians, the Church, went on growing steadily, so sure were they. We get some idea of its growth from the fact that over 500 miles of underground passages have been discovered in the city of Rome alone, where millions of Christians were buried in the first few centuries. These passages are called . . . Catacombs. By the year 400 it is estimated that there were about 10 million Christians in the world; by 1500, 100 million; by 1900, 500 million.

II.—Paul, Mark, Luke, and John

The disciples were sure they had sufficient evidence What sort of evidence have *we*? We have, (1), the evidence that we have just spoken of—the very existence of the Christian Church, which would never have got started at all unless the apparent disaster of Good Friday had been changed to the triumph of Easter; and (2) our custom, which goes back to the beginning of the Church, of celebrating the Resurrection by the Holy Communion every Sunday. We also (3) have the records in the New Testament.

But these records are not so simple as you might suppose. They were not all written at the same time, for instance. You can't just say, "O, it's all in the Four Gospels." For instance, the earliest account is not in the Gospels, but in one of S. Paul's epistles.

Well, I will make it as simple as I can. The earliest of the Gospels is S. Mark. We know a good deal about S. Mark. He is mentioned nine times, and it all fits in [*Acts and Epistles of S. Paul and S. Peter*]. He was a cousin of Barnabas: his mother had a house in Jerusalem; she was rather well off, and kept a housemaid, whose name was Rhoda [*Ac.* 12^{13}]; and her house was a place where the disciples used to meet. So he knew them all as a young man. Then S. Peter took him about,

as his companion and helper. What Mark wrote down about 40 years after [*c.* A.D. 69] was what he had heard S. Peter tell people.

But, unfortunately, the end of S. Mark's Gospel was lost in quite early days. All we have is down to verse 8 of the last chapter. You will see that this is shown in the Revised Version of the New Testament. We can get some idea of the part that was torn off from the First Gospel, which is called . . . S. Matthew, though it is not by that Apostle. But we cannot be sure, because the man who wrote the First Gospel did not copy S. Mark exactly, but added other things. Therefore it will be safer and less confusing if we leave out the First Gospel, which in any case gives only a short account.

Then there is S. Luke's account. We know a good deal about S. Luke also. At one time he was the travelling companion of S. Paul, and he was a very careful writer. He did not copy much about the Resurrection from S. Mark, but got other accounts from other people who were there at the time of the Resurrection [*e.g. The Journey to Emmaus*]. So we will put S. Luke second, always keeping the eight verses of S. Mark in the first place, because S. Mark gives really S. Peter's own account.

Then there is the Fourth Gospel—S. John. We can't be so sure about this Gospel, because we are not at all certain that its author was the Apostle S. John; and it was written a long time after—about 70 years after [*c.* 100]; and we know that people cannot trust their memories so exactly after a long time. But the account in S. John is extraordinarily vivid and convincing. I myself feel sure that the writer, if he was not the Apostle, had got hold of some record of the Apostle, and I think you may depend upon this. [*"John stands behind the Fourth Gospel," Harnack—to quote a writer from the critical side.*] So we will place S. John third—after S. Luke. This evangelist was one of the greatest writers in the world.

Then there is S. Paul, who is the earliest writer of all.

III.—Peter and Paul

I have told you all this, because if I simply said "You will find the evidence of the Resurrection by just reading the four Gospels," it would not be true. And then if you ever tried to fit them all together, you would get into a terrible state of confusion [*As Mrs. Besant did. See her Autobiography*], and perhaps give it all up altogether [*as she did, and many others*]. So we must remember that the earliest record is in S. Paul, the next is in S. Mark (and this is equally good, because S. Mark's Gospel is really the Gospel of S. Peter); that S. Luke comes next; and S. John next. And especially we have to remember that the last chapters of the First Gospel were written by someone who had not the same first-hand information, but is writing his account from what he can get from others; so that we cannot try to fit it in without confusion.

I have to ask you to attend carefully. But you can see it all on the black-board quite clearly:

The Crucifixion	A.D. 29
Conversion of S. Paul	30
Paul meets Peter	33
Epistle to Thessalonians	49
Epistle to the Corinthians	53
Mark (companion of Peter)	*c.* 69
Luke (companion of Paul)	,,

Here you see the earliest evidence. S. Paul stayed for a fortnight with S. Peter in Jerusalem in the year 33, only about four years after the Crucifixion and the Resurrection [*Gal.* 1^{18-19}]. He therefore heard all about the events which S. Peter had been describing since the first Easter Day. He met S. James also at this time [L. 64, 10].

When he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul had known about the Resurrection for 20 years. He said to them then: "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received" [1 *Co.* 15^{3}], and then he mentions the Resurrection—that Christ was raised on the third day, that he appeared to Peter, and then to many others.

Paul had delivered this to the Corinthians, *i.e.* had told them about the Death and Resurrection, four years before, A.D. 49. And A.D. 49 is the year when he wrote his first letter to the Thessalonians. In that letter he twice mentions the Resurrection. So, you see, that, although so many writings must have been lost, we do happen to possess one (1 Thess.) as early as A.D. 49—only 20 years after the Resurrection—which mentions it; and another (1 Co.), 24 years after, which mentions also five of the appearances after the Resurrection. (One of these, the appearance to Peter, is mentioned also in S. Luke's Gospel, without any attempt to fit it in, which is good evidence that Luke's additions to the original account were carefully obtained.)

Then we have the full account in S. Mark, so far as it goes, until verse 8, after which is a new ending written in the 2nd century to replace the part that had got worn and had dropped off. Mark gives us the record of . . . Peter.

Then we have the much longer account in S. Luke, which gives us probably part of what is lost from S. Mark, and some most interesting other accounts.

This is the evidence. It is as good as any evidence we have for any event in ancient history. Nay, it is better. And we need good evidence for an event so unexpected, so strange [*supernormal is the right word*], so unique as the Resurrection of Christ. We have said that it is not really so strange as we might think; that psychic science leads us to expect something of the kind; and that, in the case of one who was far above any other man in spiritual power, we ought to expect something unique and different. We have said that the Apostles testified to the Resurrection from the beginning, and that we have the records of what they said in the writings of their friends S. Paul, S. Mark, and S. Luke, as to the authorship of which we are certain. And of course we know that the Apostles, and Paul, Mark, and Luke, were honest, truthful, and straightforward men.

THE RESURRECTION

THE FIRST FOUR APPEARANCES

It is always assumed that the audience is already familiar with the simple outlines of the Life of Christ. These Lessons are to explain what they already know, and to supply what they are not likely to have learnt.

[*This Lesson may often have to be divided into two.*]

I AM going to try to give you an account of what I think happened at the Resurrection. I shall give you hypothetical [*don't explain*] dates and hours. Of course I am not likely to be exactly right; things were probably not so simple as I shall describe; very likely there was much coming and going at the Tomb, and there may have been several visits of the women. But we can piece the different accounts together quite naturally, if we keep to those writers who wrote at first-hand or second-hand—the 8 verses of Mark, and then Luke and Paul. I shall include also, but in the fourth place only, the Fourth Gospel, S. John, because I think we have something like a first-hand account there, though not written down perhaps till seventy years afterwards. I shall not include the First Gospel, which is given the name of Matthew, because the compiler of the short account there probably copied other writers many years afterwards and added descriptive touches of his own—he describes the young Man at the tomb (from S. Mark) as an angel, descending in a striking way from heaven, feeling sure, no doubt, that this was the way it must have happened; but we are not so sure. ["That of S. Matthew is of these the least trustworthy. It is comparatively late in date, and it

is highly probable that legendary matter has been mixed up with it."—*Sanday.*]

None of the writers attempted to give the exact times. This habit, of not trying to make everything fit in, shows that they were not inventing a story; but it makes the record more difficult for us.

Let us then see if we can make a probable record of what may have happened, fitting the different parts together from the different accounts.

(*a*) *The two Maries and Salome*

The probable day of the Resurrection was Sunday, March 20th, A.D. 29. On that day the sun rose at 6.5 a.m.

At about 6.30, as I suppose, some women came to the tomb, including Mary the mother of James, Salome, and Mary Magdalen. S. Mary Magdalen was not the sinner-woman, but a woman who had been healed by Jesus [*Lk.* 8^2]. The other S. Mary, the Mother of Jesus, was probably alone in her sorrow at Bethany, a village nearly an hour's walk distant. The tomb was outside Jerusalem, about 20 minutes' walk from the city gate. It was now light [*Mk.* 16^2]. The writer of the Fourth Gospel thought of it as being still dark: but this was 70 years afterwards, when details would be forgotten; and S. John was not present himself. This is an example of why we must prefer earlier accounts to later—though, of course, there may have been another visit of the women before sunrise.

(*b*) *Mary Magdalen*

The tomb was a very small cave in the rock. Salome and the other Mary found the stone rolled away and went in. They found it empty, and called out to Mary Magdalen, who was behind them. She was horrified to hear that the tomb was empty, and ran straight away: she went to the lodgings of Peter and John in Jerusalem (about 20 minutes, or a mile, away) to tell them.

(c) *The other Mary and Salome*

Meanwhile the other two women pressed into the little cave, and found a young man [*Mk.*], or, probably, two young men [*Lk.*], dressed in white. They were probably Christian disciples of the priestly class [*or Essenes*], who used to dress in white. In the Fourth Gospel they are called two angels; but by this time the account has become less clear, and Salome and the other Mary are left out. There may have been two angels or messenger-spirits. But the earliest account (S. Mark) does not say so. The young men told the women that Christ was risen.

These two women, Salome and Mary, were frightened, and ran back into the city, telling no one [*Mk.*]. Later on (say, about 7.30 a.m.), they did tell the Apostles, who thought what they said were idle tales, and did not believe them [*Lk.*].

(d) *Peter and John*

On hearing from Mary Magdalen (about 6.45 a.m.) that the tomb was empty, Peter and John at once ran there, as fast as they could go, from the city. They were convinced by what they saw, and returned to their own lodgings at about 7.30 [*Jn.*], we may be sure eagerly discussing every possibility.

(e) *Other Disciples*

Between 7.45 and 9, some other disciples, who had heard the report, came and looked at the tomb [*Lk.* 24^{24}.] No doubt there was a growing eagerness to discover what had happened, and much discussion.

Jesus had not yet appeared to anyone; and his first appearance, according to my calculation, was not till the afternoon. Mary Magdalene spent the rest of the morning in a despairing effort to find out what had happened to the body of Jesus. She could think of nothing else.

There must have been much confusion and excitement that Easter morning. No one had yet seen Jesus.

Each of the evangelists gives us some fragments of what happened, and we can only piece them together—like a broken vase. And even S. Peter's account, which is no doubt what we have in S. Mark, is only what he had gathered from the women, and remembered after. While, when the Fourth Gospel was written, the women would have been almost certainly all dead, and so their account could not be checked. S. Luke evidently knew the women, and it is probable that his account was got from Joanna, the wife of Chuza, Herod's steward [*Lk.* 8^{3}], who was with the other women at the tomb [*Lk.* 24^{10}].

But the accounts of the actual appearances of our Lord are much clearer. Everything settles down when Christ appears, and the disciples begin to understand.

The Appearances

1. *S. Mary Magdalen*

March 20th, 2.30 p.m.

[*All these accounts can be expounded by quotations from the original text if this Lesson is divided into two. Or some parts of the text may be read separately as a gospel, if there is a service.*]

[*Jn.* 20^{11-18}] Mary Magdalen returns to the tomb, still in despair because the body of Jesus is gone. Jesus appears to her. At first she thinks he is the gardener. His spirit has materialised; or, in other words, the natural body which his spirit had built up in his lifetime (as ours do) has become a spiritual body. At first his body is less definite and less recognisable. Mary Magdalen is spared a too sudden and overwhelming shock. Then he says, "Mary," and she recognises him.

2. *Cleopas and his Friend*

2.45—7 p.m.

[*Lk.* 24^{13-35}]. Two men, one who gave the account to S. Luke, the other whose name was Cleopatrus (or Cleopas for short), started at 2.45 to walk to Emmaus,

about 7½ miles from Jerusalem, or about a quick 2 hours' walk. They had been with the Apostles and other disciples in the Upper Chamber. Mary Magdalene arrived there soon after these two had left, and told the other disciples that she had seen Jesus. They were not convinced, she had been "hysterical" before she was healed: besides she had herself thought at first that he was the gardener.

Cleopas and his friend walk towards Emmaus. At about 3 p.m. Christ joins them. He talks, as they walk along together, but they also do not recognise him in his spiritual body. At about 4.50 ("towards evening") they arrive at Emmaus. At supper they recognise Christ. He disappears; and they start back (at about 5.10) to tell the others in the Upper Chamber. They hurry, because of their news; and besides, it is dangerous to travel after dark (*i.e.* after 7 p.m.)

3. *S. Peter*

c. 6 p.m.

[*Lk.* 24^{34}; 1 *Co.* 15^{4}]. We know nothing of how this happened. The Apostles were still discussing Mary Magdalen's story, and other reports, when S. Peter came hurrying into the Upper Chamber with the tremendous news that he had seen Jesus. This set their minds more at rest; and when Cleopas and his friend returned from Emmaus, they crowded round them and said, "The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." S. Paul also mentions this appearance.

4. *The Apostles in the Upper Chamber*

Between 7 and 7.30 p.m.

Lk. 24^{36-43}; *Jn.* 20^{19-23}; *cf. Ac.* 10^{40}]. As the Apostles sat, with closed doors, for fear of the Jews, listening to the story of Cleopas and his friend, Jesus appeared in their midst. At first the Apostles were terrified. Jesus does not argue with frightened men; he invites them to touch him. No one dares. Jesus then, to

reassure them, asks if they have anything to eat. If he had seemed to appear suddenly, like a mere phantom or ghost, he would now assure them of the reality of his new spiritual body. They give him a piece of broiled fish, and he partakes of it. The startled disciples—torn between their joy in this sudden hope and their fear that it might be an illusion—are now convinced, full of exaltation, and wonder, and joy. Jesus a second time says, "Peace be unto you," and then tells them that they have a great work to do, "As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you."

This was the 4th appearance, the last on Easter Day. There were six more after that day, which we will talk about next time.

[*These two Lessons—the next more especially—are made rather long, partly for the Teacher's own guidance and partly for the benefit of rather advanced classes. For others they can either be shortened or made into three—or into four—lessons, when there would be time for more quotation from the Gospels. In any case, the subject is of the utmost importance and should not be scamped.*]

64

THE RESURRECTION

THE LAST SIX APPEARANCES

5. *The Apostles with S. Thomas*

Low Sunday, March 27th

[*This Lesson also will often be divided into two.*]

[*Jn.* 20^{24-9}]. We do not know what happened during Easter Week after the first Easter Day. The next appearance of Christ that we are told of was on the next Sunday. . . . S. Thomas had not been with the other Apostles when Christ had appeared to them in the Upper Chamber. When they told him, he was not convinced. This was not from unbelief or disloyalty, but because he felt he could not feel sure of the personal identity—"How do you know it was the Lord?" he must have said, "You own that his body was not an ordinary body. It may have been a phantom, and a phantom may be anything." We have this point of view exactly expressed in Hamlet (Act I.):

> The spirit that I have seen
> May be the devil; and the devil hath power
> To assume a pleasing shape . . . I'll have grounds
> More relative than this.

S. Thomas said that he would not believe unless he could put his fingers into the wounds of Christ. Then Christ appeared in their midst, and showed at once that he had read Thomas's thoughts—"Reach hither thy finger. . . ." Thomas was convinced by this, and did not need to put out his hand and feel the wounds. He just cried: "My Lord and my God!" There is not necessarily any rebuke in our Lord's words; they may mean simply: "Doubt not any more, but be assured."

[In the Appendix to S. Mark (16^{14}), this is quite misunderstood, in the sentence "he upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart."]

6. *At the Lake of Tiberias*

About March 30th, or ten days after Easter.

[*Jn.* 21^{1-23}.] After Low Sunday the Apostles left Jerusalem, and began to earn their living again by fishing. They fished all night on the Lake of Tiberias (*i.e.* the Sea of Galilee), and caught nothing. At daybreak a man hailed them from the shore—"Hullo, lads, have you anything to eat?" When they shouted "No," he told them to try the other side of the boat. At once they caught a lot of fish. Then they guessed, and John said to Peter, "It is the Lord!" Peter dashed into the sea, the others followed in the boat. There was Jesus on the shore, and a little fire, with breakfast all ready. Jesus told them to bring in their fish, and to come and have breakfast. They were all a little shy, and no one dared say, "Who are you?" because they knew it was the Lord. Jesus took the food and gave them breakfast. Then followed the beautiful conversation with Peter—"Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me . . ." [*cf.* L. 68, 5]—you remember?

7. *Five Hundred in Galilee*

Two or three weeks after Easter.

[1 *Co.* 15^{6}; *Mk.* 14^{28}, 16^{7}.] S. Paul wrote in his first letter to the Corinthians (A.D. 53): "Then he appeared to above five hundred brethren at once, of whom the greater part remain until now, but some are fallen asleep." This seems to have been in Galilee; because Mark tells us that Christ said at the Last Supper: "After I am raised up, I will go before you into Galilee"; and also because the Young Man at the tomb said to the women, "But go, tell his disciples and Peter, he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him as he said unto you." No doubt in the last page of S. Mark (which, you remember, was worn off and lost) there was

an account of this meeting in Galilee. The First Gospel (Matthew) has an account which may have been taken in part from that lost ending, and it tells us that they met on a hill, which is probably correct, but the writer had only heard of the eleven Apostles being there.

[The use of the baptismal formula, however, in Mt. 28^{19}, and the mention of observances which Jesus had commanded, are so unlike the general teaching of Christ, that we shall be safer not to claim this account as a correct summary of all that Christ said. It suggests a tradition which has grown shorter, and has become set in accordance with Christian practice in the early Church.] S. Paul's evidence is the best of all. It is the earliest, and he had known many of those 500 brethren since his conversion in the year 30—about a year after it had happened.

This meeting in Galilee must have been a very important one. It seems that, during the appearance at the shore of the Lake, Jesus had told the Apostles to go round and summon all the other disciples, arranging for them all to meet on a certain day. On the appointed day, little groups of disciples must have appeared from different directions on the hill by the lake, and have walked up till they came to a level place where they found Jesus awaiting them. He must, I suppose, have spoken to them for some time; and S. Luke tells us [*Ac.* 1^{3}] that at these appearances he talked about his old great subject, the Kingdom of God. If you remember the things he said about the Kingdom of God in the Gospels [*see Vol.* I., L. 9–12] you will not think that he spent the time laying down rules for the Church, as people sometimes imagine. His idea of the Kingdom was far greater than that. But I do think that he may have told them some practical points which we find them carrying out so soon afterwards in the Acts. They made S. James their chief later on—although S. James had not been an Apostle; they kept together, and met for worship on the first day of the week; and they had a religious meal together, they broke the bread, which was a love-feast [*the Agapê*] and

the holy Communion combined. Such things as these they may have talked about with Christ. Above all, he made them his witnesses. There were now more than 500 people who had seen him after his death.

8. *S. James*

About a month after Easter.

[1 *Co.* 15^7.] S. Paul wrote one short sentence, "Then he appeared to James." He wrote it while S. James was still alive. He tells us [*Gal.* 1^{19}] that he met S. James three years after his conversion (four years after the Resurrection), when he stayed with S. Peter. That is all we know. But it is an enormously interesting appearance, this 8th one. James was one of Christ's brothers. He had not believed: none of Christ's brothers had believed on him [*Jn.* 7^5]. But at the beginning of the Acts [1^{14}] we find that James was among the believers; and he was afterwards made the head of the Church—he became, as we should now put it, the first bishop of Jerusalem. How odd this sudden change! we should say, if we did not happen to be told by S. Paul that Jesus appeared to his brother after he had been crucified. That made James a believer.

Can't one imagine that meeting! How James would have begged his brother's pardon, and said, "Thank God, I was wrong! I see it all now!" or something like that. How Jesus would have put it all gently away—for he never had a word of blame even for those who had put him to death. And then perhaps how James talked of their boyish days together, and of all the things he had failed to understand when Jesus began his work. But we can hardly imagine what Jesus said to *him*. We are told so little of what Jesus taught after the Resurrection. It looks as if he did not wish to add to the Gospel he had preached in his earthly life. All that he had taught was true. There was little more to add—little that they would understand. Christ did not write rules and books. He gave his great message. Then he proved it by rising from the dead.

James was a common name, and we are sometimes

confused because there were three Jameses. Our one here is called James the Just. He is also the writer of the Epistle of S. James, which shows him to have been a great, simple-minded, true-hearted Christian. He also, as we have said, became after five or ten years, the head of the Church in Jerusalem.

So we have: 1. James the Just, the brother of the Lord.

2. James the Greater, the son of Zebedee. His mother was Salome, one of the women who went to the tomb. His brother was S. John: they were "the sons of Zebedee."

3. James the Less, the son of Alphaeus, of whom we know very little. Like James 2, he was an Apostle; and, to distinguish them, one was called Big James and the other Little James, or, as we call them, the Greater and the Less.

9. *All the Apostles*

About five weeks after Easter Day (Apr. 24).

[1 *Cor.* 15^{8}; *Ac.* 1^{4-5}; and perhaps *Lk.* 24^{44-49}.] "Then to all the Apostles," says S. Paul. Christ may have appeared two or three times in the days just before the Ascension; so that perhaps this appearance ought to be numbered 9, 10, 11. Our Lord's words at the end of S. Luke [24^{44-8}] may belong to one occasion, and the words at the beginning of Acts [1^{4-5}] may belong [*with Lk.* 24^{49}] to another. But, as we do not know, we will keep on the safe side, and speak of only one occasion when these things were said. This was not in Galilee, but near Jerusalem.

You see, the time was drawing near when they would see him no more, the day that we call . . . Ascension Day. And he now gathers the Apostles together, and prepares them for the last meeting. S. Luke tells us a little about it. You know, *Acts* is also by S. Luke. Christ told them not to leave Jerusalem [*Ac.* 1^{4}], and

arranged with them to meet him on the following Thursday near Bethany [*Lk.* 24[50]]; and promised that they would be given a great gift of the Spirit of God which was the promise of the Father [*Ac.* 1[4]], and they would be "clothed with power from on high" [*Lk.* 24[49]]. They were to be witnesses of what they had seen [*Lk.* 24[48]]. So they were prepared for the last meeting of all.

10. *The Ascension*

Thursday, April 28.

This was the last appearance of our Lord—his last meeting with his disciples. But S. Paul includes another —the occasion when he was travelling to Damascus, and Christ said to him, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?"—and many Saints since have been sure that our Lord appeared to them [1 *Cor.* 15[8]]. But such visions after the Ascension do not belong to the same class as the 10 appearances on earth before the Ascension: they were more like visions—peeps—into heaven.

We will take the Ascension for our next subject after the Revision.

Well, there is the evidence. I cannot imagine any fair-minded man, at the present day, who studies it, doubting that Jesus Christ appeared after his death many times and to many people. Some of the evidence is earlier, and therefore better, than other. The earliest of all is that of S. Paul, who wrote in his letter to the Galatians [1[18–19]] that he had stayed two weeks with S. Peter, only four years after the Resurrection, and had then talked also with S. James; and he is certain about the Resurrection, and mentions (as we have seen) five out of the ten appearances, in his first letter to the Corinthians [15[4–7]]. We might wish that S. Peter had written a book himself about it; but the last thing the Apostles thought of was to write books. The idea of religion being founded on infallible books was quite foreign to their minds; and in this they were true followers of Christ. But we do have what S. Peter believed in the 8 verses of his companion . . . S. Mark. And S. Luke gives us other very close accounts.

[*The next Lesson should be a Revision.*]

65

THE ASCENSION

I.—Not like the Pictures

OUR Lord met his disciples at least ten times after his death; he appeared to them and talked with them ten times, and the last of these times is called the Ascension. It was the farewell meeting. After that, he passed into a higher plane of existence, a higher kind of life, a higher sphere, which we call Heaven.

We generally have rather curious ideas of this farewell meeting, which we have got from the old artists. I don't think any artist has tried to paint it as it must really have happened. You know, they picture Christ as rising higher and higher into the sky, in the sort of way a balloon rises; and the idea was that he rose still higher, till he became a tiny speck, and then was lost to sight in a distant cloud. They used to think that the sky was a big blue roof, and that heaven was on the other side of it.

That would have been a marvellous portent. Everybody in Jerusalem would have seen it. Everyone would have been converted. The Gospels and other early Christian books would have been full of it. But, as a matter of fact, there is very little about the Ascension in the New Testament. In fact, it is only described in the Acts. For the words in S. Luke [24^{51-2}] "and was carried up into heaven," and "they worshipped," only occur in some of the ancient manuscripts, and were probably not in the original Gospel which Luke wrote. You can see this for yourselves in the R.V. margin. Then, you remember, the last part of S. Mark [16^{19}] is not the original ending, so that doesn't count either. Then again S. Paul does not mention it, in his list of

Christ's appearances [1 *Cor.* 15]. The apostolic Church believed intensely in the ascended Christ, but did not lay much stress on the manner of his Ascension.

All this shows that the Ascension was not the marvellous portent which we see represented in pictures, but was a quiet farewell meeting. S. Luke describes it very quietly in the only account we have . . .—not his gospel, but the first chapter of the Acts, which is also by . . . S. Luke. Just one sentence—"He was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight."

Is it described anywhere else? . . . No.

II.—What it was like

Let us try and imagine what happened. Jesus had arranged with the disciples to meet him on the hill near Bethany some three miles or so from Jerusalem. Early on the Thursday morning, the Apostles, with perhaps a dozen of the other disciples, left Jerusalem quietly, and followed the path towards Bethany. When they reached the appointed spot, they found Jesus waiting for them, in a little dip near the top of the hill; and, I take it, there was a mist hanging over the hill on this April morning. As they walked, they must have been full of discussion as to why this meeting had been arranged and what was going to happen. Dear men! They still did not understand about the Kingdom of Heaven! No wonder people have failed to understand it since! They still thought that it was some earthly kingdom; and they crowded round Jesus and asked: "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" [*Ac.* 1[6]]. He put their question aside, and told them again that they were soon to receive power from God. They were to have the gift of the Holy Spirit, he said, and they were to be his witnesses. And as he talked with them they began to understand that he was going into heaven, and that they would see him no more in this life. Then he went from one to the other, and blessed them each very tenderly, as they knelt down with streaming eyes. Then, as they looked up at him,

he vanished from their sight. He had vanished before, each time that he had met them in his earlier appearances; but this time it was different. He vanished in such a way that they should understand that he had gone into heaven, that he had ascended. I suppose his body—his spiritual body—floated up a little way from the ground, and then vanished into the mist that clung round the top of the hill. "As they were looking," says S. Luke, "he was taken up, and a cloud received him out of their sight."

III.—The Two Men

Then two strangers came up to them, as they were looking upwards in their sorrow. It is generally assumed that these were two angels; but S. Luke does not say so; he simply says that two men in white apparel stood by them. Sometimes by a "man" he means an angel, and sometimes of course he does not. In this case the two "men" speak like very ordinary men; and this makes me think that perhaps they were not angels. They may have been two of those men who belonged to Jerusalem or Judaea, and who had believed in Jesus in rather a cold and secret and distant kind of way [*Jn.* 12[42]], and thought themselves a good deal above Christ's intimate disciples from Galilee, which was in the north a long way off. We know there were such disciples, and the priestly class did wear white raiment [L. 63, *b*]; and I suppose that these two had heard about the meeting, and had been watching at some little distance. They now say, "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into heaven?" That sounds just a little condescending. Imagine the scene in London—Hampstead Heath—two priests in cassocks addressing some rough fishermen from Yarmouth [*or some other place*]:—"You Yarmouth men, why do you stand looking at the sky." And they don't speak of the Lord in that tone of adoring love which his intimate disciples used. "This Jesus," they say, "which was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like

manner as ye beheld him going into heaven." That idea, that Christ would soon come back in judgement, was very widespread: it was human, but not, I think, angelic. This is one of the texts that have made people so often think that a Judgement Day would soon come.

IV.—God's Way

Now this account of the Ascension, or farewell meeting, is very remarkable, because it is all so quiet and natural.

There are many stories in ancient writers of people being carried up into heaven, with shouting, and trumpets, and winged horses, and a blaze of light. They sound to us like fairy tales. But this is quite different: it is quiet, without one word of excitement or exaggeration; and natural, without a word put in to make a fine picture of it, or to make it portentous and splendid. People used to think that, when God did anything, he did it in some wonderful and impossible way —churning up the ocean, burning the earth, brandishing thunderbolts, riding on monsters. But we know that the quiet natural things are the greatest signs of God, and that his greatest works, in the spirit of man as in nature, are done without display, without terrors or wonders. And how like the quiet way of God is the Ascension, as S. Luke describes it!

V.—Afterwards

If we had no account of the Ascension, we should still know that it had happened. How? Because the Apostles at once settle down, confident and happy, to their work. They understand that he has parted from them, and gone into heaven, and that they will see him no more till they too come to heaven. If he had not shown by his manner of parting that he would not come back to earth again, they would have been always expecting him to appear, always thinking he would come back and resume command. And they would have grown sick with hope deferred. As it was, they waited quietly till Whitsunday—ten days after; and

then we see them, full of hope and enthusiasm, and inspired by the Spirit of God himself.

Christ had gone where they could no longer see him, but where he was near to them all the time. And the Spirit of God came to help them. "It is expedient for you that I go away," he had said [*Jn.* 16[7]].

Where had he gone? To . . . heaven. We have to talk as if heaven was in space; and once or twice I have used the words "high," "higher," "up." I said that he went to a higher place. But that is only because we have no better words. Heaven may not be high above England, or above New Zealand on the other side of the earth. It is a different kind of existence, and may be quite near us. Heaven is where God is perfectly seen, and where eternity is. And Christ became near to everyone in the world, for ever, when he went into heaven.

66

IN HEAVEN

I.—The First Martyr

WHEN the first Christian martyr was killed, he met his death in a remarkable way. Who was the first martyr? . . . And how was he killed? . . . People had met death bravely and patiently before, often and often. But at this first execution of a Christian three new things happened:—(1) As they threw the heavy stones down at him, Stephen said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." (2) Then he knelt down, all battered as he was, and called out very loud, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge"; and, having thus prayed for his executioners—as Christ had done (though he did not use quite such tender, thoughtful, understanding, words as Jesus Christ had used)—he fell asleep. It is a beautiful picture of the new way of dying. But (3) before he was stoned, he had a vision of heaven, and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing. He cried, "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God" [*Ac.* 7^{55-60}]. One young man who was there must have been greatly impressed. You remember who stood by, and took care of the stoners' clothes? . . . Saul, who afterwards became a Christian, and is called . . . S. Paul.

II.—Metaphors

Stephen saw Christ standing in the very presence of God. The Creed speaks of Christ as sitting. So we know that even in ancient days people could not have meant it quite literally—though they *were* much more literal and child-like than we are. We don't think

that there is a big throne in heaven with God always sitting on it, and Christ always sitting at his right hand. That is only what we call a *metaphor*—a picture to suggest a spiritual meaning. If you speak of the "fall of Cardinal Wolsey," that is a metaphor. You don't mean literally that Wolsey slipped on one of his oranges and fell down: you mean that he lost his lofty position and power. When in Shakespeare [*these lines are really by Fletcher*] Wolsey says, after his fall [*Hen. VIII.*, III. 2]:

> I have ventured,
> Like little wanton boys that swim on bladders,
> This many summers on a sea of glory;
> But far beyond my depth—

that is a metaphor too. And so it is in Richard III [I. 3], when, Queen Margaret, also speaking of a fall from high estate, utters the magnificent lines:

> They that stand high have many blasts to shake them;
> And if they fall, they dash themselves to pieces.

And very many of our Lord's sayings are metaphors, *e.g.* "Ye are the salt of the earth."

The metaphor in the Creed of course means that at the Ascension Christ passed into the immediate presence of his Father, and was in the highest glory and honour, and is thus, now and for ever.

IV.—Many Heavens

We once said [L. 59] that there must be many heavens, that is, many stages (or, if you like, many forms or classes), many spheres of happiness and glory. "Heaven" should always be in the plural. S. Stephen did not say, "I see heaven opened," but "I see the heavens opened." And in the Lord's Prayer it is always "Our Father, which art in the heavens" [ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς]. The Jews and early Christians believed in seven heavens (and "seven" was only a way of saying "many"). Our Lord spoke of "many mansions," which means "many abiding places" [*Jn.* 14[1]]. S. Paul says that his spirit was once caught up into the third heaven

[2 *Cor.* 12^2]. He also speaks several times of "the heavenlies" or "heavenly places" [*e.g. Eph.* 1^3]. In the Epistle to the Hebrews [*He.* 4^{14}], the writer (who was not S. Paul), says that Christ is a "great high priest, who hath passed *through* the heavens." Christ never called himself a priest or a high priest; he was a prophet; but his followers used the word afterwards sometimes; and this writer gives clearly the idea of Christ passing through all the heavenly spheres till he reached the very Being of God himself.

S. Paul expresses this thought in a magnificent passage [*Eph.* 1^{20}], where he says that God "raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named . . . and he put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body."

V.—The Heavenly King

Christ, then, passed into the highest place in the spiritual world. Or, if you like (since all this is above space and time), into the very heart of the divine glory, into the very centre of spiritual wisdom and power. In all the things of the spirit he rules, and he is king. His ideals, his hope, his insight—all that he saw in the Kingdom of Heaven—these alone have the conquering power. And the world goes forward only in so far as it listens to the voice of the heavenly King.

When there is misery in the world, degradation, oppression, and great sin, when there are hatreds and wars, it is because men will not make Christ their king. He is in the centre of all beauty and goodness; but men prefer to follow the other King—Mammon—and then disaster creeps on. "The royal banners forward go": yes, but under which king?

The phrase "on the right hand of God" is very valuable because it prevents (or should prevent) people thinking that Jesus ceased to be a man, and just became

a part of God after the Ascension. He is still a man, according to Catholic theology, a distinct human soul, but perfectly united with the Logos (you remember—the Word, or Reason, or Thought of God). So you may think of him as like the Saints in heaven, only with this difference:—they enjoy the vision of God and have communion with God; but Jesus Christ is perfectly and for ever united with the Word of God. He is one with God. This is not difficult to understand; because when Jesus lived on earth he was a human being, a man, perfectly united with the Word, or Logos; but on earth he was limited by being a man: he did not, in his human nature know everything—he was not omniscient—nor had he the power to do everything that is possible, or to be everywhere [L. 53]. But when he ascended through the heavens, to the right hand of God, those human limitations were left behind.

[Much of our confusion, T. will remember, is due to our going beyond the careful statements of the old orthodox theology. The Catholic faith is (1) The Logos or Word of God existed in eternity, (2) the man Jesus did not exist before his human birth: there was no pre-existent human consciousness of Jesus Christ. (3) At the Incarnation, the Logos was united with the man Jesus. (4) God the holy Trinity was not incarnate in Jesus, but only the Word or Son of God. (5) This is the divinity of Christ. God the Father was not incarnate in Christ; God the Father did not suffer on the Cross. (6) Jesus Christ is now in heaven, with the Father, a distinct human spirit perfectly united with the Logos—"on the right hand of God."]

VI.—Immortality

Jesus died; he triumphed over death; he passed through Paradise into the highest heaven, into the very heart of the beauty of holiness. He solved the grim riddle of death. Men had always sorrowfully pondered it, but there had been no clear answer. Do you remember Bede's famous story of King Edwin and his

thanes, when Paulinus came to Northumbria to tell them about Christ? Edwin said he would like to take counsel with his wise men. They discussed the new message together, and this is what one of them said:

"Another of the king's counsellors, an alderman, took up the speaking, and said, 'O King, this present life of man, compared with that time beyond which is unknown to us, seems to me like this: When you are sitting with your aldermen and thanes at supper in winter time, with a bright fire burning in the midst of the hall, while outside the rain and snow are beating against the walls—lo! a sparrow flies swiftly in at one door, and swiftly through the hall, and out at another. He was safe for a moment from the wintry storm while he was indoors, but after that short spell of warmth he disappears. From winter he came in, and to winter he goes out. Such is the life of man: he appears for a little while. But what went before? And what will follow after? This we do not know. Therefore, if this new teaching bring us anything more sure, it is worth our following.' "

So our forefathers won their new hope, and became Christians, because [2 *Tim.* 1[10]] Jesus had "abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light."

67

JUDGEMENT

This is a long Lesson, and will probably be divided by some and shortened by others. But the subject has to be grappled with, if religion is to survive among the young. I have treated it in the way which I think scholars will agree upon in the near future.

I.—Apocalyptic

(*The Points are of course written on the blackboard, or at least spelt out.*)

THE Jews in our Lord's time were filled with ideas about a great catastrophe which was to happen in the world. This was called "apocalypse," and we speak of these ideas as "apocalyptic": the word is a Greek one [ἀποκάλυψις], and means *uncovering*—the unveiling of mysterious events that were to happen in the future. They thought that one day all the sorrows of the oppressed Jewish nation would come to an end: there would be a huge smashing up of the world —the sun and moon would be darkened, the stars would fall from heaven, angels would come flying down with trumpets, the Messiah would arrive in glory and set everything right. They wrote many books about this apocalyptic, both before and after the New Testament times. We have one example in the Book of Daniel, the latest book of the Old Testament, which was written about 170 B.C.; we have another in Revelation, at the end of the New Testament. "Revelation" is the same as unveiling or apocalypse; and this book is often called The Apocalypse. It is full of the gorgeous and terrific poetic imagery of apocalyptic, and was probably

written as a splendid protest, at the time when the Roman Emperor, Domitian, was persecuting the early Christians.

So it was that the Jews in our Lord's time were constantly using this tremendous kind of language. They talked apocalyptic, and they thought apocalyptic. You remember two little instances—the other day, when we were talking about the Ascension. (1) The Apostles said, "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" They expected an apocalypse—some mighty supernatural restoration of the Jewish nation. Even then, at the last, they did not understand Christ's spiritual and moral teaching about the Kingdom of Heaven. Then (2) the two men in white, who came up after Jesus had disappeared, also had this apocalyptic idea. They said: "This Jesus, which was received up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven" [*Ac.* $1^{6\text{-}11}$]. Now as people have generally supposed these two men to be angels, you can imagine what a great effect their words must have had on Christians afterwards. Then remember how full of magnificent pictures the Book of Revelation is; and you can understand how Christian writers and painters and sculptors spread everywhere this apocalyptic idea—this idea of a vast catastrophe, and of an imminent Judgement Day, full of splendour and horror—trumpets and earthquakes, lightning and fire, angels and devils, shouts and screams. I expect you can all remember such pictures. They used to paint the Last Judgement over the chancel arch of our churches, and also to carve it on the porch.

II.—Misunderstood

The disciples, then, had been bred in apocalyptic ideas: they simply could not get them out of their minds. And no Jew could talk for long about religion without using this apocalyptic language. Our Lord sometimes used it himself, but he gave it a new meaning, a different meaning, a spiritual and moral [ethical]

meaning. We may be certain that they often remembered some of his words, and forgot the new meaning he gave them—just as they did on Ascension Day, or when James and John asked him to promise them the two chief places—on his right hand and on his left—when he should come in glory [*Mk.* 10^{37}].

Even after the Ascension, the disciples kept going back to these ideas. For a long time they expected the end of the world to come every day. Even S. Paul did at first, in the earliest of his letters—the first Epistle to the Thessalonians—he thought there would be a shout, a trumpet, the Lord would descend, and they would "be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air" [1 *Thes.* 4^{17}]. Afterwards he abandoned this idea, and it is not found in his later Epistles. The early Christians gradually gave up expecting this sudden end of the world; and the writer of the Fourth Gospel discards the apocalyptic idea.

III.—The Little Apocalypse

The chief example is in S. Mark [13^{3-27}], and is called "the Little Apocalypse." There is a good deal of doubt as to the main part of this 13th chapter of S. Mark. Many scholars think that it was a fly-leaf circulated in the year 70, to give consolation to the Christians at the Fall of Jerusalem; and that afterwards this leaf got incorporated in the Gospel. It is full of the Jewish apocalyptic idea, though not in the usual exaggerated language of the Jewish writers; it describes the misery of the fall of Jerusalem, and then speaks of the sun and moon being darkened, the stars falling, and Christ coming in clouds with great power and glory. This passage in S. Mark is not at all like the real sayings of Christ: it is much longer, and the vocabulary is different—that is, the more important words in it are not the words which we find in other parts of the Gospels. From this Little Apocalypse come the similar passages in Luke and Matthew, and most of our ideas about an imminent judgement day.

[*The subject of eschatology cannot be omitted because so much popular religion is based upon it. Ten years ago the "thorough-going" eschatological interpretation of Schweitzer seemed to hold the field; to-day it is being urged that the eschatological passages are misunderstandings on the part of the early Church. Opinions may have matured, or may have changed, ten years hence.*]

You know that a great part of Luke and Matthew are taken from the earlier Gospel, Mark. S. Luke, and the unknown writer of Matthew, had S. Mark's Gospel before them: they copied large portions out, but made little alterations as they wrote. Therefore, when we find a difference in these portions, we take S. Mark as the original text. Sometimes the First Gospel adds a good deal in order to explain the original—remember this was a long time after, perhaps in the year 80 or 90, or even a little later. Now if you look at Luke [21[20]] you will find that he has taken the Little Apocalypse from S. Mark, but has shortened it, though he has added a few touches of his own. S. Luke was not a Jew, and therefore was less interested in apocalyptic. But the author of "Matthew" was a Jew to his finger tips, and he not only copies from S. Mark almost word for word, but adds sentences to heighten the effect; it is he who puts in that the coming of Christ will be like lightning flashing across heaven, that all the tribes of the earth shall mourn, and it is he who gives the angels trumpets [*Mt.* 24[27 30 31]].

It seems then that our ideas about the last day come mainly from one source, the Little Apocalypse in Mark; and that this was a separate sheet written at the time of the Fall of Jerusalem, forty years after the death and resurrection of Christ.

IV.—The Parable of the Judgement

We should be mistaken in blaming the early writers for using apocalyptic language. Very likely the blame is ours for taking them too literally. Perhaps it is the old question of prosy people misunderstanding poetry.

I have mentioned this before; the people with dull, literal minds are sometimes really a great nuisance! I expect all these apocalyptic phrases were meant originally to be pictures of great ideas. But then came the dull people with literal minds . . .

For instance. One of the very greatest examples of our Lord's teaching by poetry is his picture of the Judgement. Being in Matthew [25[31]], it is probably coloured a little with that unknown writer's apocalyptic language. But there it is, unmistakable in its greatness. It has the very heart of Christ's teaching. It describes the judgement of men. "I was hungry and you gave me meat"—you remember how it goes on; and then, "Inasmuch as you did it to one of these my brothers, even the least, you did it to me." There you have a wonderful, vivid story—a kind of parable—going to the very heart of the matter, telling us what judgement is; and yet people have taken it for a literal description of an event that is to happen in the future—as a description of the last day.

V.—Later Ideas

From such misunderstandings grew up all sorts of ideas. Jesus had taught quite simply, in a splendid picture, that those who did kind actions would be blessed, and that those who never thought of helping others would be accursed. By the end of the 3rd century, people began to make pictures of him (in the Catacombs) as an imperial judge; as time went on, they thought of him more and more terribly, and turned to the Virgin Mary for love and protection. Then they came to think that they ought to be terrible judges themselves (because if we think that God is cruel, we shall be cruel too; but if we think of him as love, we shall become loving). They began to persecute people—to condemn them, not for being unkind and selfish, as in the parable, but for their religious opinions. The Church which had once been the Church of the Martyrs, became itself a persecutor; and many good Christian men (long

before the fires of Smithfield) were martyred by the rulers of the Church.

It is all very strange. The Church passed gradually from one idea to another about the end of the world. The first Christians thought that there would be a Judgement Day speedily; and then, as the Judgement Day did not come, they altered their minds, and thought there would come a thousand years of happiness—the *Millennium*. By the 3rd century that was given up. Then S. Augustine said: "We are *now* living in the thousand years—the Millennium—because the Kingdom of God is the *Church*." That idea worked until the year 1000, when the end was expected to come. It did not come; and then people said, "The Kingdom of God is in the next world, and we shall never have it here." And that was the worst mistake of all.

VII.—The Divine Judgement

If there were no judgement, the world would be a most miserable place, and like a nightmare. For if there were no judgement, there would be no justice. Evil and good are mixed up here, and the good people often seem unrewarded; so many are unhappy, in pain or poverty, for no reason, and with no justice, that we can see. And we men judge so unfairly! We have such false standards; we often despise and neglect the weak and the poor, and bow down before the rich and the strong. Christ was not like that. He shows us what God is like. It is the nature of God to judge, to separate the wheat from the chaff, to disentangle good from evil, to put everything right.

God's judgement is going on now. We do not know when it will be finished. I do not think it will be finished on one particular day; but you and I are making our choice every day, and *this* day; and every choice we make has its result, and fits in with the judgement that is being made. We must use every opportunity of doing good—and we have plenty; we must never put off goodness, but be ready. As we sow, we shall reap,

Indeed we are beginning to reap now: the harvest is begun already.

We must not try to trace a judgement in what happens to others, or to condemn them. "Judge not, that ye be not judged" [*Mt.* 7[1]]. But we *can* trace the judgement in nations and empires; that Fall of Jerusalem, for instance, and, later, the Fall of Rome. Or the French Revolution, or the Great War, or the Russian Revolution. Men forget to act justly, to feed the hungry . . . they seek power and pleasure and money—nations give way to pride, fear, cruelty—and the crash comes. They have denied Christ, and by Christ and the standards of Christ they are judged.

Lo, all our pomp of yesterday
Is one with Nineveh and Tyre!
Judge of the Nations, spare us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget!

[*This might be sung: E.H.* 558.]

68

THE GOOD SHEPHERD

I.—Forgotten

OUR last few lessons have been rather difficult. But I could not help it. We had to try and clear away misunderstandings which are hundreds and hundreds of years old, and which many people still think are true. Many people have given up religion because they thought these misunderstandings were part of the Christian Gospel. Now the teaching of Christ is wonderful, and beautiful, and quite simple: "The common people heard him gladly" [*Mk.* 12^{37}]: but it was too simple and too good for men at first—especially, it was too merciful and full of love; and people since have generally thought—"He couldn't have meant to be as kind and merciful as all that," and so they have often exaggerated the severe sides of his teaching, and have forgotten—yes, forgotten—those sayings of his, and those deeds of his, that proclaimed his infinite love.

The Gospel of Christ is put in a nutshell in the three words, *God is love.* But what we said last time about the Judgement will show you how quickly men overlaid this with another idea, *God is vengeance.* There is a great picture by Michelangelo in the Sistine Chapel at Rome which shows what they had come to think in the sixteenth century. Christ is standing—his arm raised in a terrible gesture, looking like an angry Greek god (like Zeus hurling his thunderbolts); the Virgin Mary kneels at his side, with her hands joined and face averted; at the bottom of the picture, writhing, tormented sinners are being driven into hell, into the unthinkable torture of endless fire, at the command of this

relentless Wielder of vengeance, who is supposed to be the Son of Mary.

So I am putting in here a Lesson about something that Christ really said about himself—something that is quite simple, and is so beautiful and full of love that it was forgotten.

People forgot that Jesus was the Good Physician, that he went about healing thousands of people, that his Gospel is a Gospel of Healing—that where a nation is Christian there ought to be healing, and health, and happiness in body and soul, for all.

They also forgot that he is the Good Shepherd.

II.—The Early Church

"Did they forget?" Perhaps you say, "I know I've seen lots of pictures of the Good Shepherd." Yes, I'm sure you have. But this is the remarkable thing: those pictures you have seen were painted during the lifetime of your fathers or grandfathers. They belong to the 19th or 20th century. You have never seen an older one. There is not a single Good Shepherd in the National Gallery, which is full of older pictures.

Think of the enormous significance of that. It means that the Good Shepherd was forgotten during almost the whole of the Christian era, and was not rediscovered till the nineteenth century. Pictures do thus help us to understand Christian history (that is, what happened to the Christian religion). Sometimes they help us more than the history books. [*Church historians have failed to give adequate ideas of their subject because they have been ignorant of art.*] Anyhow, we cannot understand about Christianity, as it has developed from age to age, unless we know a little about pictures and architecture and other arts.

Isn't that a very curious thing, that the Good Shepherd was forgotten? I will tell you what makes it even more curious. The *Early Church*, the Church of the early Christian Martyrs, loved the idea of Good Shepherd more than any other idea. The religion of the Early

Church was the religion of the Good Shepherd. We know this because we know something nowadays about early Christian art. When Michelangelo was painting that terrible picture of a cruel Christ in the Last Judgement in Rome, he did not know it—but quite near him, under the ground, in the Catacombs just outside the walls of Rome, were hidden away scores of early Christian paintings on the walls, and everywhere Christ was represented as the Good Shepherd. A few of these pictures actually are as old as the First Century; they were painted when S. John the Evangelist was still alive.

Isn't it strange then that the religion of the early Church should have been the religion of the Good Shepherd, and that afterwards this religion should have been clean forgotten?

III.—Afterwards

It was forgotten in the 4th century, when the Emperor Constantine was converted to Christianity. Then the Church, which had been the Church of the Martyrs, became strong and powerful; it became the Church of the Empire; it did many great and splendid things, and overcame frightful difficulties; but it forgot about the Good Shepherd. People began to make instead pictures of Christ as Judge, and also as the Ruler of All [the Pantokrator], and in a few generations the All-Ruler had entirely taken the place of the Good Shepherd. As time went on, Christ was more and more represented also on the Cross; as well as in Judgement. In the time of William the Conqueror and afterwards [*Romanesque and Gothic art*], they were very fond of putting lurid sculptures of the Last Judgement over the west door of churches, so that everyone should see them as they went in—and paintings of the Judgement, even more horrible, over the chancel-arch, so that people saw them as soon as they got in, and all through the service. Perhaps some of you have seen one of them . . .?

So you might describe the history of Christian thought by saying that for the first three centuries the people

thought of Christ as the Good Shepherd, then for a thousand years chiefly as the imperial Judge; and since then chiefly as the Martyr on the Cross, or as the Babe in his Mother's arms. They never represented him as the great Teacher, and never since the days of the Early Church as the mighty Healer—the Good Physician—or as the Good Shepherd, until the 19th century.

[*Addison's beautiful paraphrase of Ps.* 23,—*E.H.* 491 —*shows how the shepherd idea was reviving in the beginning of the* 18*th century. George Herbert's*—*E.H.* 93—*a century earlier, did not attain to popularity.*]

IV.—Understanding Christ

There is one more curious thing about all this. Even in the early Church the religion of the Good Shepherd was the *popular* religion only. We find it everywhere in the art of the people, but even the earliest Fathers and great writers of the Church hardly ever refer to Christ as the Good Shepherd. You might go through a whole shelf of ancient books without finding this. So it was in the Middle Ages, and afterwards. The Good Shepherd is not in the Creeds, nor, I believe, in any of the Catechisms of the Churches—and certainly not in our Prayer Book Catechism or Baptism service, where you might have expected it.

All this is important, because it shows how difficult it has always been for Christians really to understand Christ—to realise the whole of his divine character. They have always thought of him in one or two ways only, and often these imaginary pictures were exaggerated, distorted, or even untrue. If you go to a gallery of old pictures you can see what the people were taught—many true things—the Nativity, Crucifixion, Resurrection, but little about his life between the Nativity and the Crucifixion; a great deal about his mother, and many untrue legends about her, and about her imaginary parents, Joachim and Anne; but little or nothing about Christ's kindness to men and little children, or his works

of healing, or his teaching and parables. Christ is so far above us that we have never really understood him. And our great hope for the future is that we are beginning to understand him a little better, and may hope to follow his example more than in past ages.

V.—The Sheep

Jesus often thought about shepherds. I daresay that as a boy he had sometimes looked after the sheep. He must have often watched shepherds and chatted with them. You remember that even in that parable of the Judgement he thought of the nations as sheep—and goats. In Asia the sheep are smaller and skinnier than here; and it is quite difficult to tell them from the goats, which are often driven with them. The only way to tell is this—the sheep's tails turn down, and the goats' tails turn up.

"A man is of more value than a sheep," he once said [*Mt.* 12[12]]. And in that beautiful passage after his Resurrection [*Jn.* 21[15]], when he asked Peter, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou me?" three times, and Peter passionately answered that he did, Jesus answered three times as the Good Shepherd:—"Feed my lambs," "Tend my sheep," "Feed my sheep."

And he told the beautiful parable of the Lost Sheep [*Lk.* 15[3]]:—"What man of you, having a hundred sheep, and having lost one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders rejoicing. And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and his neighbours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep, which was lost." So he bade us here to think of him, not as our Judge, but as our Saviour.

VI.—The Shepherd

It is in the Gospel according to S. John that our Saviour is called the Good Shepherd, and the Greek

words mean more literally "the Beautiful Shepherd" [ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός]. Is not that a nice thought—the Beautiful Shepherd? The early statues and pictures of him represented a beautiful youth (not with a beard, but with curly hair), dressed like an ordinary shepherd-boy of the time, and carrying a lamb on his shoulders. [*Matthew Arnold's sonnet about the picture of the Good Shepherd carrying a kid is without foundation.*] Sometimes he has a milk-pail, and sheep browsing round him, and sometimes he is painted with the pan-pipes that shepherds used to play. Thus the early Christians thought of him. Only you must remember that the Gospel according to S. John was written a long time after—about 70 years after—our Lord spoke; and therefore we cannot be sure always about the exact words, and there is a curious sentence about robbers—"all that ever came before me are thieves and robbers" [*Jn.* 10[8], *cf. v.* 2] which I feel sure is a mistake. "Ever" is not in the original; and some versions omit "before me." So the original may have been—"all that came are thieves and robbers"; and that looks like a corruption of something else. In any case we can be sure that Christ did not say that his predecessors were thieves; partly because that is meaningless, for we know that he thought highly of the old prophets, and many others; and still more because it is not at all like him to say "all that ever came before me are thieves and robbers." The writer also seems to be remembering two different occasions, in one of which Jesus had compared himself to the door, in the wall that makes a sheepfold in the East, and the other in which he speaks of the shepherd. I expect Jesus really put it in a parable—"There was a lovely Shepherd. . ." [*This is the more likely because the Fourth Gospel does not put anything in parable form.*] We will end by reading some of the sentences:—

"He that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep. To him the porter openeth; and the sheep hear his voice; and he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out. When he hath put forth all his

own, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him: for they know his voice. And a stranger will they not follow, but will flee from him: for they know not the voice of strangers. . . .

"The thief cometh not, but that he may steal, and kill and destroy: I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly. I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd layeth down his life for the sheep. He that is an hireling, and not a shepherd, whose own the sheep are not, beholdeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth, and the wolf snatcheth them, and scattereth them; he fleeth because he is an hireling, and careth not for the sheep. I am the good shepherd; and I know mine own, and mine own know me. . . . And I lay down my life for the sheep. And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold. Them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd."

Is not that very beautiful?

[*Revision here.*]

69

THE HOLY SPIRIT

I.—Ghost or Spirit

TO-DAY we begin the Third Part of the Creed. The first was about . . . God the Father—Yes, God as Creator. The Second was about . . . God the Son—the Word (Logos), or Thought, of God manifested in Jesus Christ. In fact the Second Part was about the person of Jesus Christ, and his life; because in him the Word or Logos of God was incarnate. Jesus is Divine, and he perfectly reveals the true nature of God.

Now the Third Part of the Creed is about . . . God the Holy Ghost. Yes, the Holy Spirit. In English we often have two words with the same, or nearly the same meaning; one comes from the old English or Anglo-Saxon, and one from the Latin (often through Old French): thus "fatherly" is from the Anglo-Saxon, and "paternal" is from the Latin [What word? . . . *Pater*]. Here in the Creed we have the old word "Ghost," which is from the Anglo-Saxon "gast," and is like the German "geist." It means exactly the same here as "Spirit" [French, "esprit"; Latin, "spiritus"]. But as nowadays by a "ghost" we generally mean an apparition from the next world, let us use the word "Spirit" when speaking of God.

The Greek word for spirit is *pneuma*, and from this you get our pneumatic tyres on bicycles and motor-cars. How odd! Why? The reason is interesting. Both these words in Latin and Greek mean "wind," "air," or "breath"; and if you pronounce them, you will notice that all sound like air—just as "bubble" sounds like water: "spiritus," "pneuma." In Russian

the word is "duch" [*pronounce as in German*]; in Hebrew rûah. [*It will interest them to hear these words emphatically pronounced.*]

So, you see, in old times, uncivilised men cast about for words that sounded like the wind: then they found out that part of man can be felt but not seen, and they called it the *spirit*—that is, the breath or wind of man because the spirit of man is invisible. And they used the same word for the spirit of God; and Christians call him the Holy Spirit. You can see the *effects* of air —for instance . . . a ship sailing, a tree blown down. So you know it exists. But you can't see the air, as a rule.

II.—"It"

The Holy Spirit, then, is—to begin with—something that can be felt and not seen. I want to make you understand, and I think we shall understand much more easily if we don't use words of gender or sex at first, like "he" and "him," but just use the neutral pronoun "it." You see, "he" sounds so very *human*. Some theologians have suggested that we should speak of the Holy Spirit as "she," and that does help to remind us that both "he" and "she" are equally inadequate, and that we really ought to have a special divine pronoun. [*S. Jerome suggests the idea of the Holy Spirit as a mother, adding "In divinitate nullus est sexus," in his Commentary on Isaiah*, xl. 3.]

Our bodies are the temples of the Holy Spirit. That does not mean that a "he" or "she" is living inside you; it means that part of God's Spirit is inside you; *it* is inside you, this divine power and goodness, and it is part of God. We can easily think of that, just as we can easily think of the air inside us. [*Why we really say "he" and not "it," is explained in the next Lesson.*]

When you feel a loving spirit within you, when you want to do some kind unselfish act, that is the spirit of God in you. It is always in you; it tells you the difference between good and evil: if you are tempted to do wrong, you feel a little voice in your mind telling you what is

right. That is God's Spirit working in you, and we call it Conscience. A conscientious man is a man who listens to the Spirit of God within him.

We know that there are all kinds of lovely and glorious things around us and above us [*T. stretches out his arms*]. We want these qualities. We want to be noble and splendid, strong and good; we want to understand all those qualities that make life worth living. They are the Spirit of God. The saint asks, and receives, because God gives his spirit to them that ask him [*Lk.* 11[13]]; the scientists seeks, and he finds—bit by bit he finds Truth, and that is also the Spirit; the artist—the poet—knocks, and to him is opened the world of divine beauty and understanding, and that is the Spirit too.

So, all that we once said about the Kingdom of Heaven [L. 9–12] is contained in the doctrine of the Spirit; all that world of holy loveliness that lies about the feet of God, is the world of his Holy Spirit. All the happiness that comes to good people is the reward of the Spirit, the enjoyment of the Kingdom. The man who is full of the Spirit is called in-spired. All inspired writers are full of the Spirit; all great musicians are singing of the Kingdom of God in the power of the Spirit. All great art, of all sorts, is struck out of the mind of man by a strong emotion. There is no great art without that strong feeling; and that emotion is the stirring of the Spirit in the heart of man.

Perhaps the easiest and simplest analogy is to think of the Creator as like the sun, and the Spirit as like the sunshine. Everything that lives on the earth owes its life to the sun; but the sun itself does not touch anything—only the rays of heat and light which are for ever streaming out from the sun. They are like the spirit of the sun; you look across the street on a bright day, and the whole space is crammed full of the sunlight—from one wall to the other; and even in the shadow there is plenty of sunlight—quite enough to read by. So even in our human hearts—under the shadow of our many faults—there is the Holy Spirit.

III.—God in all Things

Christianity discovered the Holy Spirit. Jesus Christ, in his perfect union with God, revealed this fact.

Please do not think of Christianity as some people do. They really seem to think that the Jews believed in one God, and that the Christian religion added a second, Jesus Christ, and then a third, the Holy Ghost. This is of course quite wrong.

God was always the same. People tried to understand about him. Sometimes they felt that just to say, "God is a person," was not enough. It did not seem to explain everything. So they thought there must be many lesser gods, looking after all the different things that happen.

Other people thought that God must be inside everything, like electricity, and not a person at all. They thought that everything is God, whether good, bad, or indifferent. This is especially common in India, and is called Pantheism.

The ancient Jews at first thought that Jehovah was the greatest and best among many gods, and that the gods of other nations were real but inferior. Then came the great Prophets of the Old Testament who taught the Jewish people that there is only one God. They laid tremendous stress on this truth that there is only one God; and this discovery of the Jewish prophets was enormously important. But they thought of God also as One Person; and there is always a difficulty about that. People are so apt to think of him as like a very powerful man, very old—with a grey beard. You can see by old pictures and writings that they *did* think of God as like that—as an old man, with a long beard, sitting up in heaven, and very much disgusted with the world he had made, and generally angry with it.

Well, to think like that is really idolatry, and is quite wrong, and seems to us nowadays rather childish.

But how have we managed to keep that great truth that God is One and is our heavenly Father, and at the same time to think of him as *everywhere*? We think

of him not as an old man, confined in a personality, but as the infinite goodness and power— "immanent," as we explained once [L. 43] *in* everything; as well as "transcendent," above everything. How do we manage to combine these two sides of the truth? By believing in the Holy Spirit. Christianity really reconciles all forms of religion. Both the Jewish ideas, and the pagan ideas, and the Indian ideas were really imperfect. Christianity teaches the truth that is in all religions, and unites all true ideas in a higher truth.

IV.—Love

God is not merely a person. Indeed, as we have said before [L. 36], it is not strictly orthodox to say that God is a person. He is more. He *includes* personality. And in him are three manifestations, the Father, the Word, the Spirit; and these manifestations possess wisdom, personality, consciousness.

So there are two supreme original elements in Christ's teaching:

1. God is the loving Father.
2. God is something which flows in you. God is life. God is love. God is all good qualities, all the *values* of life.

That is the doctrine of the Spirit.

Do you understand? It is not enough to say that God is a supreme Being who has certain qualities. He *is* those qualities.

He is not a Being who possesses the quality of goodness. He is Goodness itself. That "Goodness itself" is the Holy Spirit.

He is not a loving Person merely. He is love. An old writer (S. Thomas Aquinas) said that the love of the Father and the Son *is* the Holy Spirit. The greatest sentence of the Christian religion, "God is love," is the doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

[*The theology of this is summed up in a twelfth century hymn, "Amor Patris," translated by Robert Bridges, E.H.* 438, *the first two verses of which might be sung here.*]

70

THE PARACLETE

I.—We know in part

MY little dog knows me very well. He can pick me out of a crowd by scent alone; he understands my ways, and most of what I say to him. I suppose that, if he thinks about it at all, he thinks that he knows all about me. But he only knows a little part of me; most of me he does not know at all. And this is because his little mind can only understand certain things. He can't ever know me as you know me. I am with him more than I am with you; *all* of me is with him; but he can only take in *part* of me—that simple part which appeals to his dog-mind.

So it is with us and God. We can only understand part—just that part which our little minds can reach. Our knowledge of God can only be a beginning, while we are in this life. In the next life, our knowledge will grow till it becomes complete, till we know even as we are known; now we see in a glass darkly, but then face to face [1 *Cor.* 13^{12}].

Now people are always forgetting this. They are always making the mistake of arguing as if their knowledge of God were complete. Our knowledge can only be a beginning. But we must try to secure one thing about it—that it is a right beginning.

When we think of God as our father (or as our mother) that is a right beginning. But when we think of him as an angry old man with a beard, that is a wrong beginning. It is at the back of most of our idolatries, most of our wrong and cruel mistakes, and false ideas about God. Jesus smote that old idea, but it has been a long time dying.

Jesus taught that God is our kind, loving Father. There he gave us one true beginning for our thought. But he also gave us another way to begin to think about God. He taught that God is spirit [*Jn.* 4^{24}]. This is recorded especially in the Fourth Gospel, when people were getting to understand it better.

II.—Signposts

If I were to try to explain all this, I should only muddle you. So it is best just to think of one or two things—like sign-posts pointing in the right direction. A sign-post is a very good thing when it points right; but it may be a very bad thing if it points wrong. Let us try to point in the right direction.

The Holy Spirit is like the sunshine of God, as we said last time; and that gives us an idea. But we must not forget that God is altogether spirit: he is not like the sun, which is a huge mass of incandescent matter. The sun is only one of the things he makes. God himself is spirit.

The Holy Spirit is a manifestation of God. And if we want to explain *what* manifestation, we can say—the Love of God shown in Goodness. Christ taught that God is love; and Love, when it is active, is Goodness.

This divine Goodness, this sunshine of God, streams into us, and makes us good, and wise, and happy—as we shall see later. But this Goodness, this Holy Ghost, *is* God; therefore we do not merely say *it* streams into us, but *he* streams into us.

This Holy Spirit is always in us. We are always connected with God. Love working as Goodness is always in us. But it depends on us whether our connection with God is strong or weak, whether the Spirit in us is more or less.

The Spirit—the sunshine of God—is always in us. But sometimes it comes in greater measure. It came like that at Pentecost. The object of sacraments is to help it come to us in greater measure; to remove obstacles and increase our connexion with God. Like pulling up the blinds, and throwing open the windows.

When people have a large measure of the Holy Spirit, we speak of them as inspired. Inspiration makes people wise as well as good; because when our hearts are fired with love, our minds begin to work much better.

III.—The Paraclete

Once or twice S. Paul calls the Spirit of God the Spirit of Jesus Christ [*Rom.* 8^{9}; *Phil.* 1^{19}].

Our Lord was filled with the Spirit, and that is why his actions were so full of love. All the Christian saints tried hard to be like him; but perhaps none of them has succeeded in showing that strange miraculous power of love, except a very few like S. Francis of Assisi, who perhaps comes nearer to Christ than anyone else (but not so very near, after all).

S. John's Gospel describes Jesus as full of the thought of the Spirit, at the end of his life on earth. He told his disciples that they would not be left unhelped when he had gone, but that another helper would come. Another Comforter; the word is "Paraclete," which means an advocate—literally, one called to our side to help us: so it is translated "comforter," which means "strengthener," or *helper* [*Jn.* 14^{16}, ^{25}, 15^{26}, 16^{7}]. We cannot perhaps be sure of the exact words in this beautiful passage, because it was written such a long while after; but the writer seems to have got the very mind of Christ. And we may be sure that our Lord taught much about the Spirit, the Paraclete, in the last days. He made his disciples look forward to a new enlightenment; and, when Pentecost came, they were ready.

IV.—Life, Light and Goodness

People are often puzzled by the doctrine of the Trinity, and we shall speak of it again. [*T. had best repeat L.* 37 *either after L.* 75 *or after L.* 90.] But the doctrine of the Holy Spirit does help us to understand. Indeed, the doctrine of the Spirit is the doctrine of the Trinity.

We can write it down quite shortly like this:
God is:

1. Life: the Father.
2. Light: the Word.
3. Goodness: the Holy Spirit.

1. God is Life. He is manifested as the Creator, the Father of all.
2. God is Light. He is manifested as the Word, that is, the Logos or thought of God, whom we call the Son of God. In Jesus Christ the Word became flesh and dwelt among us.
3. God is Goodness, the Holy Spirit.

These three are one in *Love*. So we say that God the Holy Trinity is Love. Life, Light, and Holiness (or Goodness) emanate from him.

We sing, as our Christian doxology! "Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost." It would be equally correct to sing: "Glory be to the Creator, and to the Word, and to the Spirit." And it would be equally true to sing: "Glory be to the Life, and to the Light, and to the Goodness of God."

Because all these three are God, and therefore all these three are one.

Do you remember we once said that there are three spiritual things which man can rightly desire—only three good spiritual things? They are Goodness, Truth, and Beauty. There must be some connection between these three supreme things and the three "Persons" of the Godhead. Must it not be like this?:

God the Creator is Life, revealed in Beauty.
God the Word is Light, revealed in Truth.
God the Spirit is Goodness.
[*Or, Love energising as Goodness.*]

And all three are one. Goodness is beautiful:

"Beauty is truth, truth beauty,"—that is all
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.

[*Keats when he struggled for "intuition against intellect," by no means overlooked the rest. He wrote, "I find there is no worthy pursuit but the idea of doing some good in the world," and he was devoted to the intellectual search for truth. If T. reads the stanza from the "Ode to a Grecian Urn," he should point this out.*]

So Goodness streams out from Life and Light—the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and Son, in the words of the Nicene Creed [*in its Western form*]. The Father and the Word are one in Holiness. Life, Light and Goodness are the conscious activities of Love; and Love is God.

[*Love has been specially identified with the Holy Spirit (as by S. Thomas Aquinas, who said that the love of the Father and the Son* is *the Holy Spirit). But it will help us best if we keep our categories clear, remembering that Love in operation* is *Goodness.*]

71

PENTECOST

I.—Pictures

I WANT you to-day to think of the coming of the Holy Spirit to the disciples at Pentecost, which was the day we now commemorate on . . . Whitsunday. People generally have a strange picture of Pentecost in their minds, an unreal picture which makes it seem like a fairy-tale. This is partly due to some of the hymns they sing, partly to the phrase "divers languages" in the Proper Preface for Whitsunday, but most of all to pictures. In nearly all pictures, and especially in old ones, you see the Twelve Apostles sitting in a nice room, with S. Mary in the middle, all wearing their haloes very neatly, and on each head, besides the halo, rests a neat little tongue of flame; and some of the best known hymns describe a scene of great quietness—"soft as the breath of even."

So let us turn to the account which S. Luke gives in his second book. What was his first book . . .? And his second . . .? Well, in the Acts (chapter 2) S. Luke gives us an account which he must have got from the Apostles, whom he knew very well. So we may assume that it is substantially correct, for he was a very careful historian. Let us see what S. Luke actually does describe.

It is not at all a quiet scene, but a scene of great excitement. The Disciples of Christ had been waiting quietly for something to happen, because on Ascension Day Jesus had told them that they were to remain together until they should receive power from on high. They had waited; and on the tenth day (the ninth after the Ascension), a Sunday, something did happen. We call it, the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. This

does not mean that the Disciples were without the Spirit before, but that at Pentecost it was given them in greater measure. This happens to all of us sometimes. We go along in an ordinary way, and then suddenly we feel quite different; we feel strangely excited—stirred to do some right and fine thing, or to make our lives nobler and better.

II.—What really Happened

I think that to understand what happened we must imagine the Disciples on the flat roof of a house, such a roof as is common still in the East, with a parapet round it. On the roof would be benches and cushions, making it a comfortable open-air room, where very likely many of them had slept the night before. There was probably an awning over it; or over part of it, for it made a very large room, this house-top.

The Disciples met together (for prayer, no doubt), early on this Sunday morning. Then two unusual things happened: a noise like a strong wind was heard, and light began to flicker on their heads. Some scientific people (psychologists) tell us that unusual things of this kind do sometimes happen now: they call them "supernormal sounds" and "supernormal lights," meaning that they are not normal or usual, but above the normal.

There was a strange sound then, like a strong wind, which filled all the house; and a strange light, which looked like fire, dividing and glancing around. The description does not speak of "cloven tongues of fire," as people often do; but only says that the light divided in the way fire does, and that this light rested on each of the disciples—"*it* sat upon each of them" (*v.* 3).

Then the account goes on to say that they were all "filled with holy spirit," or "filled with the holy spirit." They were filled with enthusiasm and power, which came from the Spirit of God.

In their excitement they raised a great shouting, all speaking at once. They "began to speak with strange tongues as the Spirit [here it is *the*] gave them utterance."

What were these strange tongues? We will speak of them again in a week or two [L. 73]. Here we will just say that in times of great religious excitment people do speak in a strange way: they try to express themselves differently from the way of ordinary speech; and there is a special word for this—"glossolaly," or "speaking with tongues." S. Paul has much to say about this. Probably then they all broke out in glossolaly. In any case, they spoke very loud and all at once, so that they were unintelligible; and the noise was heard outside.

So it must have been like this: The Apostles and the others on the house-top heard a supernormal sound and saw a supernormal light. They were filled with enthusiasm, and in their excitement began to shout and sing all at once.

Then people began to collect in the narrow street outside. The disciples crowded to the parapet, shouting and cheering and singing. A great crowd collected in the street.

III.—The Crowd

This crowd stared up and listened, without being able to pick out any words in the hubbub. But after a bit they began to *understand*. The *meaning* came into their minds. Sometimes you can convey a meaning without words, and even without making any sign. For instance, some people can go into a dark room while some one in another room thinks hard; and after a time the man in the dark room can write down what the other man is thinking. We call that "telepathy." Sometimes also a whole crowd gets carried away with an idea, and has the same thoughts. This is called [*by the psychoanalysts, e.g. Dr. Jung*] "the collective unconscious." I won't trouble you with learning more about this; but the important thing to remember is that all that happened at Pentecost is being shown by modern science—by psychology—to be perfectly true. It happened then, and similar things have happened since.

So the crowd understood. It is often said by learned people who write about the New Testament (com-

mentators), that S. Luke tells us the disciples spoke all sorts of languages which they had never learnt. But S. Luke does not say that. What he says is that "every man *heard them* speak in his own language."

Imagine the scene. The disciples straining over the parapet, and pouring out excited speech; perhaps in Greek, which was a general language in those days; perhaps in traveller's Aramaic, which all would understand; perhaps in "glossolaly"—at all events with so much noise and confusion that it was impossible to distinguish more than a word here and there.

The crowd below rushing about, asking questions, straining upwards, are "amazed and perplexed," as they listen to the rapt, exalted torrents of words from the parapet. Gradually the meaning forms itself in their minds. They begin to understand; they understand more and more.

Now we cannot think without our thoughts forming themselves in words. [*See, e.g. Croce's "Aesthetic."*] Try. Think of what you were doing an hour ago. . . . You are putting it all into words. . . . So, I take it, these people put the thoughts that came to them into words, in their minds, as they understood: Parthians, Medes, and Elamites, into dialects of Hebrew; Egyptians, Libyans, Cyrenians, into Greek.

The voices, the gestures, the modulations and tones of voices, the fiery enthusiasm of the speakers, and "something in the air," take them captive, bring them into unison. The Spirit moves them all. They understand; and their understanding clothes itself in words. "How hear we, every man in our own language wherein we were born?" So they say, most of them. But some do not hear in this way; some mock and say, "They are filled with new wine."

IV.—The First Speech

Then a new thing happens. The tumult dies down, and S. Peter gathers the other ten apostles round him, from the rest; and standing up behind the parapet addresses the crowd in his native tongue—in good plain

Aramaic. This is the first Christian speech ["apology"], the earliest speech in defence of Christianity.

The Apostles had been full of doubt and fear six weeks before. When Christ was taken prisoner they had run away. S. Peter especially had behaved like a coward. Now they are different men. S. Peter gives a grand address, full of courage and passionate conviction. He ends by calling on the people to repent and be baptised. The crowd has got larger and larger; and the end of the day's work is that three thousand souls are added to the infant Church. The first step has been made. As time goes on, those thousands will be increased to millions. And millions more have been added in the present century.

Such was the day of Pentecost. S. Peter's speech was full of the thought of *power*. Enthusiasm came with the Holy Spirit, showing itself first in a wild excitement. Then it settled down into steady power and strength.

That is the first permanent work of love in our hearts. The Spirit, which is love, gives us great strength.

[*Some modern hymns about Pentecost are rather misleading; the old Latin hymns are better, e.g. E.H.* 150, 151, 154, *the last, in the translation of Robert Bridges, the Poet Laureate, is nearer the strength of the original than Cosin's abbreviated version in* 153.]

72

THE POWER OF THE SPIRIT

I.—The Comforter

WE said that the name given to the Holy Spirit in our Lord's last words before his betrayal, according to S. John, was *Paraclete*, and that this means . . . Yes, I think "helper" is the best word. In our English Testaments, "Paraclete" is translated "Comforter," which is really rather unfortunate. Why? Because "comfort" has lost its original meaning. It literally means "to strengthen very much," and that was its original meaning; but now "comfort" suggests cushions and armchairs. It means something merely soothing. It used not to mean that. There is a medieval account of an old monastery school which says of the schoolmaster, "He comforted the boys with the stick." That was not soothing. Gradually the word lost its meaning of "to strengthen"—lost the idea which we have still in other forms of the word—"fort," "fortress," "fortitude." [*If they know Latin, "con-fortare," from "fortis," "strong"; French, "fort," &c.* The original sentence from the Chronicles of the Monastery of S. Edmund is "*con fortavit pueros baculo.*"] The meaning changed, even in the time of Shakespeare and the A.V. of the Bible, to "console," "soothe," and—a step further—"to make comfortable." To-day you sometimes hear someone say, "I am very comfortable"; and the next moment he is asleep!

Well, the work of the Paraclete is not to send us to sleep, but to wake us up. Of course it is true that God

consoles us, and comforts us. It is also true, in those beautiful words, that "he giveth his beloved sleep" [*Ps.* 127[3]]. There is a time for consolation and a time for sleep. But "Paraclete," *Comforter*, does ***not*** mean this. It means "***he who makes us strong.***"

II.—Five Ideas

So now we have got our minds clear. We began with a poetical idea (or analogy), then we took a theological idea, then a historical idea, and now a practical idea; the last will be a philosophical idea. Thus [*blackboard*]:

Poetical (to make us understand in a flash):	The Sunshine of God.
Theological (in the Holy Trinity):	The Goodness of God.
Historical:	Pentecost.
Practical (the Paraclete, or Comforter):	Strengthening.
Philosophical (the result in our minds):	Wisdom.

III.—The Heart and the Mind

What I mean by this last is that that Love in our hearts makes our minds active and sensible. You know how you don't do your best work in anything unless you are keen about it. Well, that means, unless you are enthusiastic about it—unless there is love in your heart. Enthusiasm and inspiration are much the same thing; and they both come from love. Real love, divine love, always makes us more sensible.

Here is an example:—Some men were once mending the top of a factory chimney. No ladder could reach the top, and they were drawn up and down by a rope, which ran through a pulley at the very top of the chimney. When the work was ended the men came down by the rope. But the last man but one, when he got safely to the ground, forgot, and pulled the rope out of the pulley. Then they looked up, and re-

membered. Horror! there was one man left alone on the top. He will starve to death if he stops there: he will be killed if he tries to get down. Just then this poor man's wife came along. She didn't run about screaming. Love made her clever. She shouted up: "John, unravel your stocking. Begin at the toe." John understood. He took off the stocking, and unravelled the wool. Then he tied a small piece of brick to the end of the wool, and very carefully let it down, all the way to the ground. John's wife fetched a ball of twine. They tied this to the end of the wool. "Pull!" they shouted; and John slowly hauled up the wool till he got to the twine. Then they fastened the rope to the bottom end of the twine. John pulled it up, fastened it round the pulley, and came down. He touched the ground, and fell into the arms of his wife; and they all cried and laughed and cheered. And John kept the rest of the stocking ever after, to remind the children of what a fine mother they had.

You see the point. Love made her very . . . clever: love inspired her, brought wisdom to her.

It is just the same with you, as I said. When you are keen about a thing, you do it well, you become clever at it. That keenness, that love of it, knocks out sparks from you, like the flint on the steel. John Keats was one of the greatest poets that ever lived, though he was little more than a boy—only 25—when he died. When he went to school, he was not very keen on his lessons at first, and did not do very well. But after a while he began to love poetry and literature; he gradually read all the books in the school library at Enfield (you can still see the beautiful doorway of the school-house in the Victoria and Albert Museum); he grew so fond of the old Greek stories that he used to learn off whole sections of Lemprière's *Classical Dictionary*; and he was so enthusiastic about the poetry of Virgil that he translated a large portion of it himself, and wrote it out, for his own amusement. He *loved* poetry, and so he came to know as much about the Greek and Latin stories as if he had been a great scholar. And that is

why he was able to write immortal poems like *Endymion*, *Hyperion*, or the *Ode to a Grecian Urn*. His heart moved him first. He was "inspired," and then his mind was strengthened to a vast degree of power by his heart.

IV.—Inspiration

So a man may be inspired to write a book, or to compose a piece of music, or to paint a picture, or to preach a sermon, or to design the architecture of a building. Most of all are men inspired to do fine actions and to live wise and good lives. In all these cases it is the same: the Spirit stirs men's emotions, and that makes their minds able and wise. We call this "inspiration," the Spirit *in* us. Inspiration quickens a man's powers, sometimes to a wonderful extent. But it does not make men perfect. No one has ever been perfect except Jesus Christ. It does not prevent men from making mistakes. Jesus was the only man who did not make mistakes. If you think of the greatest men who have ever lived (except the one Man), you will find that they were always imperfect; and generally the very greatest have many imperfections. Shakespeare wrote many passages that are not worthy of him. The whole life of Michelangelo is a story of unfulfilled designs: some of his pictures and sculptures are the greatest that were ever made by man; but his "Last Judgement" is a splendid failure. It is the same with the Saints. S. Francis of Assisi was, perhaps, more like Christ than almost any other saint; yet he was infinitely inferior to Christ, and in many ways his life was a mistake and a failure. Indeed it is the lesser men who make fewer mistakes, and get nearer to a quiet sort of perfection—like the Dutch painters. There was an Italian artist called Andrea del Sarto, who was called "the Faultless Painter" (Browning wrote a poem about him); but he never rose above the second rank of famous artists.

Sometimes people talk about the inspiration of the

Bible. This is very misleading; because it is not books that are inspired, but the men who write them. And the Bible is not a book: it is a library, a collection of 66 books [*or* 51, *according to the Hebrew reckoning of* 24 *instead of* 39 *books in the O.T.*]; or—if you include the Apocrypha—of no less than 80 books (O.T. 39, Ap. 14, N.T. 27). These books were written by different people at widely different times. Some are very complicated in their origin, *e.g.* Genesis, which consists of several books made into one.

So when people speak of the inspiration of the Bible, their only real meaning can be the inspiration of the great men who wrote the different books of the Old and New Testaments; and the compositions of hundreds of men come into these books. Some were more inspired, some less; a few, like some of the chroniclers, had not any very high degree of inspiration.

And, as we have said, inspiration does not make men perfect. It does not prevent their making mistakes. No work of inspired men has ever been, or can ever be, infallible in that sense. It is only much smaller, simpler writings that can be free from mistakes—like a school arithmetic book: yet even school-books are not perfect. We don't use the ones our fathers used, because school-books have been improved. Everybody once thought that Euclid was infallible; but he wasn't, and we have had to give him up.

The Bible is much too great a book to be infallible. It is a collection of books—a multitude of voices testifying to God; and it is the greatest book in the world. Unfortunately in the Middle Ages, and even earlier, people thought that a great book which was also an old book must be pretty well infallible. They had not many books in those days, and they gave tremendous reverence to those which they had. In the 13th century, for instance, scholars treated the Bible and Aristotle, and a few other books, as if everything in them must be the last word of knowledge. And unfortunately at the Reformation they carried on this medieval idea, and so some people still think that the Bible is infallible.

Inspiration is not like that. Inspiration is the power of God stirring men's hearts and strengthening their minds to do the very best of which they are capable. They are still imperfect human beings, but the Spirit of God opens their minds more and more to his goodness, truth, and beauty, and they become saints in their love of goodness, scientists in their love of truth, poets and artists in their love of beauty. And if they really open their hearts to the Spirit, then, whatever else they are, they are among the good saints of God.

73

SPECIAL GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT

Lists are purposely made a feature of this Lesson, in order to give a general impression, without over-subtlety, of varied endowments. It can easily be simplified by the omission of Points IV. and V.: or it may be divided into two Lessons.

I.—The Baptism of Jesus

WHAT are the effects of the Spirit of God upon men? Let us try and find out a little further. We said last time that the Spirit is Love, which stirs in our hearts and makes our minds wiser—just as when you are keen about a thing you become clever at it. So we can say—Love creating Wisdom—that is the main effect of the Spirit in us. Now let us go a little farther.

Even our Lord Jesus Christ received the Spirit. This was when he was baptised in the river Jordan by . . . John the Baptist. You will find the most correct account in S. Mark's Gospel [1[10]], and there you will find that the Spirit descended on him: like a . . . dove. Yes, but this Evangelist does not say that an actual dove came down, or that everybody saw a bird. Later writers thought that, and we always get that idea from pictures. What S. Mark actually says is that, when Jesus came out of the water, "he saw the heavens rent asunder, and the Spirit, like a dove [or pigeon] descending upon him; and a voice came out of the heavens, "Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased." So, once more, we must put the pictures out of our heads. Jesus came out of the water, and he saw the Spirit

coming down to him, as one might see a bird coming down; and he heard a voice from God, in his heart as I suppose, but perhaps there was an actual sound. And perhaps it was a light that he saw, coming down like a bird from the sky. He was inspired; he was full of the divine enthusiasm; and he not only felt the Spirit come into him, but he heard and saw, as he looked up into heaven.

This is why the dove is often used as a symbol of the Holy Spirit. That does not mean that the Holy Spirit is like a dove. Sometimes in old pictures, a hand is the symbol of God the Father; and a cross is a symbol of Christ. This does not mean that God is like a hand, or that Jesus is like a cross. They are symbols, and everybody understands why they are symbols. Why was a hand a symbol of God the Father? . . . Because he is the Creator, and we make things with our hands. And the cross . . . ? And the dove . . . ?

II.—His Inspiration

After our Lord's baptism, when the Spirit came down upon him, we are told that certain things happened. It is very interesting to see what were the effects of this inspiration. S. Mark says that Jesus at once went away to the wilderness to be alone: in fact, the Spirit drove him [*Mk.* 1^{12}]; he felt he had to go. Here he must have decided how he would begin his ministry, and how he would work. Temptations also came upon him, but he resisted them, and came back into the world, strengthened and ready, with his mind made up. Then he began three courses of action:

1. He preached the good news of the Kingdom of Heaven [*v.* 15].

2. He gathered friends round him to help. They were called . . . Disciples [*v.* 16–20].

3. He began to heal sick people in great numbers [*v.* 23, 29-31].

S. Luke tells us further something of this first preaching [*Lk.* 4^{16-27}]. It is all very vivid. We can see the grace

and charm of the new preacher, his modest opening, his humour, and the rapier-thrust of his irony as opposition grows. But the main part of his sermon is only hinted at, by S. Luke telling us that he explained a passage in Isaiah. What was that passage? We can learn much about the work of the Spirit by reading it. [*T. reads Lk.* 4^{18-19}.]

What is it all about? Love, a great enthusiasm of charity. Love for the poor, the captives, the blind, the bruised. It is a splendid poem that Jesus reads. His enthusiasm, his mission, can only be explained in poetry. We can imagine how in glorious, thrilling words he drew out the meaning of that poem from Isaiah. He was there to proclaim good news, and freedom, and knowledge—the acceptable year of the Lord.

So, right at the beginning, Jesus proclaims the Gospel of the Spirit. It is to bring light to people's minds, it is to make the world a good place to live in. It is to help those who are in trouble. It is to release those who are oppressed. And first of all it is to bring help and hope into the lives of the poor.

First of all, then, a really spiritual man is a man who is like Christ, who is so inspired by love that he goes about doing good. Everyone who tries to make the world better has the Spirit of God.

III.—Seven Names of the Spirit

The Disciples must have understood this all their lives. We can gather this by what we read of their doings in the Acts and elsewhere. We can get a very good idea also from the Seven Names of the Spirit, which we find in S. John, and the Acts and Epistles. [*Jn.* 17^{17} *&c.*; *Ac.* $6^{3, 10}$; *Heb.* 10^{29}; *Rom.* $8^{2, 15}$; 2 *Co.* 3^{17}; 1 *Co.* 13, *&c. This arrangement, and that of the Gifts, Talents and Fruits of the Spirit is taken from the present writer's "Power of the Spirit," where the subject is dealt with more fully.*]

So let us write down these Seven Names of the Spirit [*blackboard*]. Just think of the meaning of the words, as you write them down. The Spirit of God is the Spirit of:

Truth	Life
Wisdom	Sonship
Grace	Liberty

Love.

IV.—Gifts of Service

S. Paul says that everybody can do the works of the Spirit; and he gives three different lists. Of course he was not making three classes, and did not mean to tie his readers down to an exact number. But it is useful to think of them as three classes; and we will call them (1) The Gifts of Service, (2) The Gifts of Office, (3) The Talents of the Spirit. I think we shall get the best idea by just writing them down. Here are the Gifts of Service, gifts for everyone [*Ro.* 12^{7}]. "Prophecy" means preaching—only of the best sort. "Ministry," or administration, means doing useful things. "Succouring" is showing mercy to people who are unhappy or in distress. The rest you know. Just think of them:

Gifts of Service

Prophecy	Exhorting
Ministry	Giving
Teaching	Superintending

Succouring.

These are for everybody; the layman's gifts.

V.—Gifts of Office

In another of S. Paul's letters another list occurs of the spiritual gifts which he found in the Church. We will call them the Nine Gifts of Office [1 *Co.* 12^{33}]. They are rather more rare, and do not seem to be on the whole for the ordinary church-member so much as for those in

authority of some kind, or specially qualified in some way. Here they are, on the blackboard:

Gifts of Office

Apostles	Powers	Management
Prophets	Healing	Tongues
Teachers	Helping	Interpretation.

"Apostles" means being an apostle; and when bishops were made later on, I suppose it would mean being a good bishop. "Prophets" means being a regular preacher (of the special inspired kind), not merely preaching occasionally as anyone could do. "Teachers" means being a regular teacher. "Powers" is a curious word: it means "supernormal" powers—that is, doing rather wonderful things: such as the Apostles did. Very much inspired people always do things above the power of ordinary people. An instance is when our Lord read people's thoughts, and answered them without their speaking: *e.g.* "Jesus answering said unto him, Simon, I have somewhat to say to thee" [*Lk.* 7[40]]. Simon the Pharisee had not said anything, but he had *thought* something. [*This and the Parable of the Two Debtors might be read as the lesson to-day.*] "Healing" means making people well by spiritual means—spiritual healing: it is still quite common. "Helping" just means helping other people. "Management" is literally "steering"; it means, then, guiding rather than ruling: the inspired Christian does not try to "boss" other people. "Tongues" we mentioned when we spoke of Pentecost [*L.* 71]: in times of great spiritual excitement people speak and sing in a strange, exalted way, which is called Glossolaly, or speaking with tongues. This speaking with tongues has a meaning, just as music has a meaning; therefore it can be interpreted, and "Interpretation" is another gift. I suppose the highest form of speaking with tongues is what we call Poetry.

But, adds S. Paul, there is a still more excellent way—Charity. Love is the best gift of all.

VI.—The Talents of the Spirit

There is one other list which S. Paul gives, which we will call the Nine Talents of the Spirit [1 *Co.* 12[8]]. You must always remember that he is not making out exact lists, but mentions these things by the way, always saying that it is best of all to be nice to other people. These Nine Talents comprise all the rarest gifts, which only a few people have. Most of them, however, we have seen in the other lists:

S. Wisdom	Healing	Discerning of Spirits
S. Knowledge	Powers	Tongues
S. Faith	Prophecy	Interpretation.

About this list it is very important to remember that, in the first three S. Paul means *special* Wisdom, Knowledge, Faith. So I have put "S" for "special." All have some Wisdom, Knowledge, Faith; but some have given to them a special large amount: they are inspired to be very wise, to have great knowledge, or a magnificent triumphant Faith.

The others we have had already, except the Discerning of Spirits. All Christians at that time believed that spirits in the next world were all about them, and always influencing them. They thought there were good spirits, and bad spirits, and indifferent ones. So it was very important to *discern* the good from the bad spirits [1 *Jn.* 4[1–3]], especially when people prophesied (that is, preached in an inspired way). They thought, in prophecy, another spirit often took possession of the speaker. At the present day people are coming more to believe again that spirits can speak through a person in a trance. We call the Discerning of Spirits nowadays by the name of Psychic Research, and many people are trying to find out more about these strange things.

74

THE SIX GIFTS OF THE SPIRIT

THIS list is generally called the Seven Gifts of the Spirit; but scholars now know that in Is. 11[2] (where the list occurs) there are really only six gifts mentioned, not seven. It does not matter much; but as I always try to tell you the exact truth, I speak of six gifts. [*For the evidence see the writer's "Power of the Spirit,"* p. 35.] As we have said before, people were fond of the number seven in old times; and in the Middle Ages they always spoke of the Seven Gifts. (The 7th was really "Godly Fear," the same as the 6th, "Piety" or "Reverence," tacked on from the next verse in Isaiah, where there is a mistranslation.)

Introduction

The important thing is that the Christian Church seized on this passage from the old Hebrew prophet as the best description of the work of the Holy Spirit in men's hearts. It is the description of a very wise and strong ruler.

How splendid! People so often think that "being religious" means being soft, and "goody-goody"—being "pi"! This sloppy and sentimental idea seems to have been common in some parts of Europe since the 16th century [*it began even before the Counter-Reformation*], if we can judge by books and pictures and music. Some day we might go to a picture-gallery, and I could show you how this weak, sentimental idea began with Perugino, who as a matter of fact hated religion, and his great pupil Raphael, and has gone on ever since. (A popular modern example is Sant's "Soul's Awakening"—but there are probably examples in T.'s church!) The world is full of sentimental sloshy pictures, statues,

stained-glass windows, books, and hymns. We can't really wonder that so many people have a completely wrong idea of what Christianity is, and that many dislike the idea of "being religious"—as they suppose.

The Christian religion is really the exact opposite. It is wise, and steady and strong, manly and sensible.

The Christian religion is the religion of the Holy Spirit; and although the O.T. is not Christian, but Jewish and before Christ, you will find the same brave and manly character from the first page of the O.T. to the last page of the New.

The Christian religion is the religion of the Holy Spirit, and here are the six Gifts of the Spirit, which we will take one by one:

Wisdom, Understanding, Knowledge
Counsel and Might
Reverence.

1. Wisdom

The first three gifts are the three great gifts of the mind. Why are there three? Because, as we have said before, there are only three spiritual qualities (or activities). Goodness, Beauty, and Truth. So the Spirit can inspire us in three ways—with Wisdom for Goodness, Understanding for Beauty, and Knowledge for Truth.

So when we say there are gifts of the mind, we don't mean that they just make us clever. A boy at school may be very clever, and yet not at all a nice boy. Indeed the merely clever people are sometimes selfish, and shallow, and troublesome. There is an amusing little rhyme about this:

If all the good people were clever,
And all clever people were good,
The world would be nicer than ever
We thought that it possibly could;
But somehow it seems that it never
Turns out as it should or we would—
The good are so harsh to the clever,
The clever so rude to the good!

Well! There you see the clever not being good, and the good not being good either! Neither have *wisdom*. Wisdom means being so really good that we have a right judgement in all things. Wisdom, in the Bible, always means the true sort of goodness. The wise man always does the right thing. Wisdom then is the spiritual gift of true Goodness.

2. Understanding

Understanding means taking in and appreciating the nature and beauty of things. It is the intuition which the poet and the saint have—which we all have in some degree. God has made the whole world marvellously beautiful; if you don't see it, you have no understanding. The character of a real saint is marvellously beautiful: if you don't see it, you have no understanding. This is the power of vision and comprehension—the power of seeing, hearing, feeling the divine Beauty. Wordsworth, in his famous poem, "Peter Bell," describes a stupid man without understanding, and he says:

> A primrose by a river's brim
> A yellow primrose was to him,
> And it was nothing more.

You can *understand* that!

Few people have understanding for everything. Some have not an ear for music, some no eye for colour (some are even colour-blind), some no feeling for poetry. But generally this is the result of bad education. Most people have *some* understanding of even music, pictures, and poetry if they are given a fair chance. Perhaps everybody has. For instance, you will all like this. [*Here let a violin—or other instrument—play some air that is really good but not high-browed, e.g. the folk-tune 'Dent Dale, E.H.* 23, *or "Kingsfold," E.H.* 574.] You see you all have some understanding!

All men then can receive, more and more, the gift of Understanding—of grasping the inner Beauty of things, which is really God's beauty.

3. Knowledge

This gift is very simple. As understanding corresponds to Beauty, Knowledge corresponds to Truth. When you are learning your lessons, you are acquiring the gift of knowledge! You didn't think lessons were religion, did you? But they are. So when your lessons seem difficult, ask God to give you knowledge. And, of course, as you get older, you go on acquiring more knowledge. Your mother, for instance, has done so—when she keeps house; your father—when he goes to his work. And the doctor, and the electrician, and the farmer, and the cook—

> A servant with this clause
> Makes drudgery divine;
> Who sweeps a room, as for thy laws,
> Makes that and the action fine.
>
> *George Herbert* (*E.H.* 485)

Learned scholars, scientists, philosophers, are always seeking Truth. It is a sacred thing to seek. Knowledge of true things is a gift of the Spirit.

So then these first three gifts are gifts of the mind:

Wisdom	is the gift of	Goodness.	Its result is	Morals.
Understanding	,, ,,	Beauty.	,, ,, ,,	Art.
Knowledge	,, ,,	Truth.	,, ,, ,,	Science.

4. Counsel

The next two gifts belong not so much to the mind as to the *Will*. Counsel is the Will applied to the mind. Think of a great general, Wellington or Foch, or the greatest of all admirals, Nelson, and you have the gift of counsel. Great cleverness, wide and exact knowledge, shrewd insight, all combined with the strongest will and courage. Think of a great statesman, or any kind of ruler or manager—how sometimes he has to make enormously difficult decisions, which can't be altered afterwards. It is agonisingly difficult sometimes. Think of the eve of a great battle when everything depends upon one man. The day after Waterloo, Wellington said to Creevy at Brussels: "It was . . . the nearest run

thing you ever saw in your life. . . . By God, I don't think it would have done if I had not been there."

That is counsel in its highest form—the gift of a great king. And Christianity wants everyone to be like a king. That is why Christianity is democratic; the whole nation has to use the gift of counsel, and to share in the government. (And often the nation has been right, and its statesmen wrong, and kings wrong, like George III. in his war with the American colonists.) *You* also must have the great gift of counsel, for you are always making decisions, and you have to decide bravely, and wisely and successfully.

5. Might

This also is a gift of the Will. It is not enough to take counsel and think: you have to put the thoughts into action—to balance things up with a good judgement, *and then to act* with courage and energy and power. Some people can't make up their minds; they have no Counsel. But others can make up their minds; only then they don't *do* anything. They have no Might. I know people like that—nice people, and sensible, who could do much; but they have no driving power, and they are little use. In any club or society you will find people like that; but what makes the club a success is those who really put things through—as they say, "who make things hum."

So if you are a thorough Christian, full of the Holy Spirit, you will be not only wise and sensible, but also strong—a person of decision, energy, might.

6. Reverence

This is a gift of the emotions—or, if you like, it is a feeling. So we divide the Six Gifts into three classes [*T. points to blackboard*]:—1, 2 and 3, the Mind; 4, 5, the Will; 6, the Emotions, or feelings.

The old Jewish phrase for Reverence was "The fear of the Lord." But the word fear, which occurs so often in the O.T., almost disappears in the N.T., and is not

used by our Lord at all [*op. cit.* p. 46]; because Christianity is the religion of love, and "perfect love casteth out fear" [1 *Jn.* 4^{18}].

So the words used, in the Greek and Latin Bibles, are words that really mean "reverence" [εὐσέβεια *in the Septuagint*, pietas *in the Vulgate, of Is.* 11^{2}]. And that seventh extra gift, which got tacked on, "godly fear," means very much the same thing. Reverence is to see God in everything good, to realise our own insignificance and his infinite greatness, our sinfulness, and his goodness, our weakness and his power. Reverence is the feeling of wonder, awe, and loving gratitude, for the Great Power who orders the stars in their courses, and the electrons in the atom, the evolution of all living creatures, and the whole course of history. "Two things," said the great philosopher Kant, "two things strike me dumb: the infinite starry heavens above me, and the sense of right and wrong within me."

Without this emotion of reverence, all the other gifts would be spoilt. Wisdom becomes hardness, understanding and knowledge become cleverness, Counsel becomes cunning, and Might becomes violence. Reverence is the father of all noble character and ability. It is indeed the beginning of wisdom, as the great poem in the Book of Job says [*Job* 28^{28}].

These are the six gifts of the Spirit. A silly person cannot be religious. Neither can a conceited person. If we are leading really spiritual lives, we shall grow in strength, wisdom, firmness of action—softened by reverence, and fired by enthusiasm.

[*In an extra Lesson, T. might add that all consciousness consists of three elements—Feeling, Thinking, and Willing, which correspond to the Aesthetic, Intellectual, and Moral Activities; and that Feeling results in Reverence; Thinking, in Counsel; and Willing, in Might.*]

75

THE FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT

A. The List

THESE lists, which we are finishing to-day, are very important; because they show what were the actual results of becoming a Christian, as the first Christians found them in an age when more was known of the actual teaching of Christ. The last list is that of the Nine Fruits of the Spirit. Here they are [*T. points to blackboard*]: — Three General Conditions, five Social Qualities, and one Quality of Restraint, which is like a brake at the end of a train that keeps all the carriages under control.

G. C.
Love
Joy
Peace

S. Q.

Good Temper — Generosity
Kindliness — Fidelity
Gentleness

R.
Self-Control.

B. Jolly People

If you want to know if a person is really leading a spiritual life, and is a real Christian, just notice if he is jolly, and nice to people, and quietly strong; for that is pretty much what these Fruits come to, putting it all more in your own everyday language. This is the harvest of the Holy Spirit, the Fruit of the Spirit, the inevitable result of leading a Christian life. When you find people gloomy, and grim, or bad-tempered, or

stingy and fickle, they are not true Christians—any more than if they are greedy, intemperate, and passionate. Yet how often gloomy, hard people are thought to be religious!

But all those great, strong virtues we have been talking of would not be Christian unless they were all touched with Christian Reverence—the sense of the good God, our Father, above us—in heaven. If they are Christian, they produce the Christian character in our daily life.

This list comes from S. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians [5^{22}]. I have taken the very best translation I can find of the Greek words—that of Dr. Moffatt in his translation of the N.T. into modern English. It is more exact for us to-day than the A.V. or R.V.

1. Love

"The greatest of these is charity." Love, or real charity, is the beginning and the end, the cause and the effect, of Christianity. It is the worshipper, and the worship, and the Worshippéd—God. We may say that love is getting away from oneself—feeling an absorbing interest in all that is outside, and an intense affection. Tennyson says:

> Love took up the harp of life, and smote on all the chords with might,
> Smote the chord of Self, that, trembling, passed in music out of sight.

We might go on trying to describe it all day. But poetry helps us best. Here are, for instance, some lines from Spenser:

> Love is life's end—an end, but never ending:
> Love is life's wealth; ne'er spent, but ever spending:
> Love's life's reward, rewarded in rewarding.

2. Joy

Joy. Use any words you like that make this seem more real—jolliness, happiness, ecstasy, festivity. A very early Christian writer [*Hermas in "The Shepherd"*]

called it hilarity. Real Christianity is not merely solemn and grave, but radiant with happiness—"the most encouraging, the most joyous, the least repressive, and the least forbidding of all the religions of mankind" [*L. P. Jacks, "The Lost Radiance of the Christian Religion"*].

Flowers laugh before thee on their beds,
And fragrance in thy footing treads.

The life of Christ begins with the dancing song of the angels, he brings health and happiness wherever he goes, he passes among the flowers and birds and happy children, increases the joy of parties and feasts, often speaks of festivities, and even on the cross promises the garden of Paradise to the dying thief. Love brings joy. The real Christian is always cheerful.

3. Peace

Peace, because we are in God's good hands, and therefore ought never to fret or worry. All sorts of tiresome things happen—but *Don't worry*. To worry, to be disturbed, to be frightened, to be anxious—is to lose faith in our Father. You know that "Take no thought for the morrow," in the Sermon on the Mount, is now a mistranslation (because "take no thought" no longer means "don't worry," as it once did). It should be, as in the R.V., "Be not anxious about the morrow," or "Don't worry about the morrow."

Peace within; that leads to peace outside. No worry and also no quarrelling. No strife between boys, or men, or classes, or parties, or churches, or nations. That is Christianity! "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God."

4. Good Temper

Then we come to the next group [*blackboard*], the five Social Qualities.

First of these, Good Temper. Need I say anything about this! Forbearance, patience even when someone really injures us—still more, when they only annoy us. How we like good-tempered people!

5. Kindliness

And how we like kind people! It took the world a long time to appreciate the kindliness of Christ. People were horribly cruel—even a hundred years ago—and many still are. But a hundred years ago, even quiet, respectable people did incredibly cruel things—judges, and lawyers, and magistrates, and manufacturers. Kindness to animals has only become a great power in recent times. In non-Christian countries there has always been much cruelty; and Christian countries have been slow to learn. Yet men do see how beautiful kindness is: they have, for instance, always loved S. Giles, and there are many old pictures of him, with his deer. S. Giles was a hermit who lived in a forest, in a pagan country, and he had a pet deer. One day he heard the sound of horns and hounds coming through the wood. He seized his staff, because he hated people hunting defenceless creatures. Suddenly there bounded into the open space before his cave a panting deer. It crouched at his feet for protection. It was his own deer that he had always loved so much! Giles stepped out in front of the deer, and cried, "They shall kill me first!" The huntsmen burst through the bushes, and one of them shot an arrow. Giles threw out his arm to protect the deer; the arrow pierced his arm, and he fell bleeding on the ground. Then the King rode up and saw what had happened. "What a brave, kind man is this!" he cried. And he made his huntsmen spare the deer, and he himself stayed with S. Giles and nursed him. And they made great friends, and the King became a Christian. It was indeed by brave and gentle men like S. Giles that Europe was converted. Now isn't it queer that our forefathers so loved hunting; and yet that all the time they saw that S. Giles was right, and loved this story of his kindness?

6. Generosity

But we must hurry on! And we needn't spend time over generosity. We all love a generous person, and

feel ashamed of being stingy. Generosity here means, not only giving things away, but active beneficence—the energetic doing things to help other people. [*T. might give a well-known instance of someone who works hard at some branch of social service.*]

7. Fidelity

It is not enough to be good-natured, we must also have fidelity—trustworthiness, faithfulness. You expect your friend to be loyal, to keep his word. How often have noble men been faithful unto death! There is the story of the Theban Legion, for instance—ten thousand Christian soldiers. The Emperor Maximian ordered them to sacrifice to the idols. They refused. The emperor then marshalled them in ranks, and ordered them to be decimated, *i.e.* every tenth man slain. The survivors refused to sacrifice. Maximian then ordered a second time that every tenth man of the 9000 survivors should be slain. They stood to their ranks in perfect discipline while 900 more were cut down. A third time Maximian gave the order. The survivors answered, "We were Christ's soldiers before we were Maximian's." Then they knelt down, and the other troops slew them all.

8. Gentleness

And what is so lovely as courage like this which all the time is perfectly gentle? A knight is a gentle man. Gentleness is not only a lady's virtue—it is a gentleman's virtue also! At the close of the South African war, Lord Roberts said of his soldiers:—"They bore themselves like heroes on the battle-field, and like gentlemen on all other occasions." It is so silly for a boy to be afraid of being girlish. The finest men are those in whom what we wrongly think of as the masculine and feminine qualities are combined. I remember someone who said once, "Tell your girls to be brave, tell your boys to be gentle."

9.—Self Control

Then we come to the last of all, the restraining, governing, quality of self-control. The brake. We put it in a group by itself, because it governs all the rest. Never to slop over even in our love or kindliness, never to go wild even in our joy; to be temperate in everything, and always master of ourselves.

That is true holiness, to have all these nine Fruits of the Spirit, to be firm with ourselves and perfectly sweet to everybody else, to be a good neighbour, a cheerful comrade, and a true friend, unruffled and unsoured, to the end of our lives.

[*One, or two revisions after this Lesson. Then would be a good occasion to repeat, or recast, L. 37 on the Trinity.*]

76

WHAT IS THE CHURCH?

I.—The Church

THE word Church comes from a Greek word *Kuriakòs*, kyriakos [κυριακός], which, if you say it quickly, becomes Kirk, or Church. This word means "belonging to the Lord." The French word is . . .? *Église*; and the Welsh is—is there a Welshman here? . . . *Eglwys*. This is the Latin word, *Ecclesia*, which was originally also Greek [ἐκκλησία], and means an assembly.

So the Church is—*ecclesia* . . .? an assembly, *kuriakòs* . . .? belonging to the Lord. Yes, *an assembly belonging to the Lord*.

It does not mean the building, when we spell it with a capital C, and say "The Church."

It does not mean the clergy. Therefore it is a mistake too say "I am going into the Church," when you mean "I am going to be a parson." You went into the Church when you were baptised. So a converted savage might say "I am going into the Church" (when he was a catechumen), but not a Christian.

It does not mean, again, the Church of England. The Church of England is only part of the Church. So is the Church of Rome.

It is the *whole Church*. So when I say, "I believe in the holy Catholic Church," I mean that I believe in the whole assembly belonging to the Lord—the whole society which bears the name of Christ, the whole Christian Church.

This is such a big idea that it is too big for many people. They are too narrow-minded for it; they can't bear to think of people they disagree with belonging to the Church. There is a story of an old Scotchwoman, who believed in some very narrow idea of the Church, and

someone said to her, "I believe you really think that no one will be saved but you and the minister!" She replied, "I'm nae so sure about the minister."

Well, many people are almost like that. Some Anglicans think that Nonconformists don't belong to the Church, and once the Puritans were sometimes just as bad. Roman Catholics have to believe that their Church, governed by the Pope, is the only true Church. They must not believe in the whole Church, but only in their own part of it.

2. Catholics

We must not, then, think that our own Church is the only Church, and that all others are outsiders. That is to be sectarian or uncatholic. The real catholic believes in the Catholic Church, that is, in the whole Church.

Catholic is a Greek word, meaning, literally, "over the whole" [world]. Our other word for it is *universal*. It also means, at the present day, "broad-minded"—understanding and sympathising with many things—as when we say, "Mr. So-and-so has a very catholic mind."

When the early Christians said that the Church was catholic, they meant that it was not merely the Church of Jerusalem, or Corinth, or Rome, but was "over the whole" world. It was not local but universal.

Then, in the 3rd and 4th centuries, when sects or heresies arose, people got in the way of saying, "O, they are only small, partial things, they are sectarian and local; but the real Church is much bigger, it is universal, it is Catholic." So the word catholic came gradually to mean orthodox as well as universal. It came, as we say, to have a technical sense, a special meaning. And of course every Church said its "doxy" was orthodoxy, and that others were not orthodox.

3. Not Static, but Dynamic

I think that was a pity; because you can't expect everybody to have the same opinions—especially in

these modern times. Our forefathers thought the world was stationary, and that people would always think the same and be the same. We now know that this is not so, that the world is not static but dynamic—*i.e.* that everything has force and moves, and that life develops from age to age, that truth is always developing and growing, and that people's ideas grow and change, and, on the whole, improve, from age to age. So it is a mistake to try and fix the idea of the Church by opinion; because opinions change. It is much better to keep to the original meaning of the word catholic, and say that it means just "universal." Our Lord never made the mistake of trying to fix people's opinions. He never even wrote a book, or laid down a dogmatic system of theology: he taught the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, who would always go on educating men and revealing more truth to them. And that is what has happened. The teaching of Christ has never become out of date, but is just as modern to-day as ever it was. Evolution, development, are the watchwords of modern science; the world moves and grows; it is dynamic—not fixed. And, when other people were static in their ideas, Christ was dynamic. The Spirit, he said, will guide you, "when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he shall guide you into all the truth" [*Jn.* 16^{13}].

4. The One Foundation

That is why it is so important not to found the Church upon opinion. "The Church's one foundation is Jesus Christ, her Lord." Not opinions: opinions vary. If we say, "The Catholic Church consists of those who have the same opinions," there will certainly never be a Church over the whole world. There will only be a sect, growing steadily smaller. But if we say, "The Catholic Church consists of those who believe in Christ over the whole world," then we may be sure that the Church will grow till the whole world is Christian, and the Church is really universal.

There is a story told of Charles V., Emperor, and King of Spain, who had persecuted the Dutch and Flemish Protestants and others for their opinions, and was a very strict Papist, that in his old age he amused himself by making clocks; but he found he could never make them keep time all exactly together. And he said, "Here am I who have spent all my life trying to make men think alike, and I cannot even make these clocks keep together." Like many stories, that is too good to be true, and probably Charles V. never said anything so wise.

The Church indeed has plenty of opinions, the Church has dogmas. But it is not the opinions that make the Church: it is the Church that makes the opinions. And as knowledge grows there is not less, but more variety in the way men think of those opinions. We just can't help it, however much we should like all men to think as we do. They won't. So the Church is Catholic, not because she consists only of men holding the same opinions, but because she is universal for all Christian people, holding many different opinions. And when the whole world is converted to Christ, she will be universal for the whole world—she will be "over the whole world," absolutely and finally Catholic.

5. In the New Testament

This really Catholic Church is the Church we find in the New Testament. There is, indeed, in the sayings of our Lord little or nothing about the Church [*the two instances, Mt.* 16^{18}, *and* 18^{17}, *are disputed by scholars*], but he certainly made a fellowship of those who followed him. This fellowship is often mentioned in the Acts and Epistles—the word *ecclesia* occurs 113 times from Acts to Revelation. It is a universal and united fellowship of those who believe in Christ: each local church—each church in a particular town—belongs to the universal Church, because each member is a member of the universal Church—he is a member of Christ's body.

The local Churches—like the Church of Jerusalem, of Corinth, of Rome, of Ephesus—are each part of the one Church, but they manage their own affairs, and they have different methods of government and different kinds of ministers. There is no hard and fast uniformity; but they all agree in being believers in Christ, and followers of the Apostles. They are Catholic and Apostolic. They are all admitted into the one Church by baptism, they all meet for prayer, and on Sundays they meet for a sacred meal together, which they call the breaking of the bread. They continue "stedfastly in the Apostles' teaching, and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers" [*Ac.* 2[42]].

6. Two Conditions

Such was the apostolic Church. It had the Apostles, and it had their teaching, and the breaking of bread and the prayers; and other things, such as the Talents and Gifts of the Spirit. It also had different kinds of ministers, such as "servants" (deacons), "evangelists," "prophets," and "teachers." But these did not make it a Church. What made it a Church was that it consisted of those who believed in Christ, and that there was a way by which people could become members of it. To have any kind of society, two things are necessary:—

1. There must be some reason for the society.
2. There must be some way in which people can join it.

Take a cricket club:—

1. Reason: to play cricket.
2. Way of joining: Election, and perhaps an entrance fee.

Take the House of Commons:—

1. Reason: Government and legislation.
2. Way of joining: Nomination, election, oath.

So with the Church:—

1. Belief in Christ.
2. Baptism.

There are then two conditions for membership in the Church—belief in Christ and Baptism. The Church consists of the whole company of Christian people. The words of the old Biddling Prayer before the Sermon [*in Canon* 55] are: "Ye shall pray for Christ's holy Catholic Church, that is, for the whole congregation of Christian people dispersed throughout the whole world." Every believer in Christ who has been baptised has been made a member of the Holy Catholic Church, and *is* a member.

When you were christened, you were not baptised into the Church of England or the Church of Scotland: you were not made a little Anglican, or a little Methodist, or a little Papist, you were baptised "into the congregation of Christ's flock." You entered the universal, Catholic Church.

7. By Baptism

Yes, Mr. ——? [*An assistant—or one of the class—stands up and says: "Quakers are not usually baptised. They are very good Christian people. Are they not members of the Church?"*] Yes, I am sure they are. [*Some would say "of the invisible Church," but this sounds rather confusing and unreal.*] I said that the Church consisted of baptised believers, and that baptism is one of the two conditions: I don't say that the Church consists only of baptised believers. There have been some exceptions. But Baptism has always been the rule of the Church in all countries. Our Lord himself was baptised. The Quakers gave up that rule, and made themselves exceptions. The Holy Innocents were also exceptions; they were not baptised, but they are enrolled among the martyrs of the Church; and there have been adult unbaptised martyrs too: the ancient Church called this baptism by blood. This shows that there *can* be exceptions, (although such martyrs would have been baptised if they could). The Quakers would say that Baptism is a purely spiritual thing, and does not need an outward form; and that

they are really baptised because they are regenerated by the Holy Spirit. We do not agree with this opinion, because we think that outward things are very important; and it is not the opinion of the historic Church; but we do agree that a good Quaker has really received the Holy Spirit, and that this brings him into the Church of Christ: it is of course the inward and spiritual grace that matters most. God is not bound by the laws of the Church; he gives his Spirit to whom he wills. But we are bound by those laws, if we belong to the Church.

You may put it this way and say:—The Church consists of believers in Christ who have been admitted by baptism; but besides baptism of the usual kind—Baptism by Water and the Spirit, there can also be Baptism by blood, and Baptism by the Spirit alone.

The Church then is the one great community of Christians—vast and varied. You could go to a Greek or Russian service, to a Roman Catholic service, to an Armenian, to a Presbyterian, to a Methodist, to a Congregationalist service, and back to your own; and all the time you would not have passed outside the Church. We belong to the whole Church, in all its wonderful history, with its saints and martyrs, its heroes and its thinkers and teachers, its poets and artists, and all its mighty splendour of beauty and grace. We belong to the Church, and the Church belongs to us.

[*The hymn, "The Church of God a kingdom is"—E.H.* 488—*gives the idea in a beautiful way.*]

77

DIVISIONS IN THE CHURCH

I.—Causes

WHEN I said last time what a splendid thing the Church is, I expect some of you thought, "What's the good of saying that, when as a matter of fact there are many different churches, mostly condemning one another. The Church is all split up."

So let us speak to-day about these unhappy divisions They are of course due to the wickedness and silliness of man. If Christian people had been better, there would have been no divisions. Most of them were made long ago, by the leaders of the Church and by the leaders of heresies, who were far less civilised than we are now. Instead of making friends and talking things over, they used to abuse one another, and condemn one another; and sometimes at great councils of bishops they would sieze one another by the beard! What was worse, they sometimes persecuted one another. And if you persecute a man, you not only do a cruel and unjust thing, but you make him and his friends your enemies for life.

It was thus not only the heretics who made divisions, but the rulers of the Church as well. Remember that. We can never say truly of those who separated from the Church, "It was all their fault." Often it was even more the fault of those who ruled the Church. We must never blame other people: their Churches did wrong, but then *all* the Churches did wrong. Christ's Gospel is so big, and men are so small! Our ancestors were too narrow-minded to realise Christ's ideal of a united fellowship of tolerance and love.

So also, we need not blame ourselves—any more than the members of other Churches—Roman or Protestant. It is not *our* fault. We did not make these divisions. We need not take over these horrid old quarrels. We can say, "Here we are, through no fault of our own. Let us try and make things better."

The young Christian Churches in countries like India feel this very much. They say, "Why are we called Anglican, and Baptist, and Congregationalist, and so on? What have we to do with your old European quarrels? Why should we be divided because your forefathers were stupid, and intolerant, and cruel? We want to be one Indian Church." And they are moving quickly towards reunion in India.

So it should be with us. We must say, "Why are we divided? We *won't* be divided." Then we shall find our way to unity with our fellow Christians.

II.—History

These divisions go back a long way. We may summarise their history under four heads:

1. At first there were only small heretical sects. Often these were different types of Christianity which had become exaggerated. They rose up and died away. But the great Church herself was closely bound up with the Empire, which was partly Greek and partly Roman. Some of the Churches were not Greco-Roman, though they were part of the Universal Church. Such were the Churches of Armenia, Syria and Egypt. The imperial part of the Church began to lord it over the others, and so the Churches of Armenia, Syria and Egypt broke away; and they are still separate Churches at the present day. The spirit of liberty causes men to revolt against domination. And the fault is less with the revolters than with those who try to lord it over them.

2. But the greatest division came in the 11th century (the age of our William the Conqueror). This was the real great schism, the separation of the East from the West; one great Church went on, with its centre in the

Greek city of Constantinople, including Russia and the whole of Greek and Slav Europe. [*A drawing on the blackboard will explain this—a map, with a line drawn from the head of the Adriatic along the E. frontier of Poland to the Baltic.*] The other great Church, the Western Church, went on quite separate.

From this time, the 11th century, the organised Church has not been one. Not counting the ancient separated Churches of Syria, &c., it was divided into two; and each half said, "I am it." The Eastern Church said, "We are the only one true Church." The Western Church said, "We are the only one true Church."

In the sight of God this must have seemed very foolish. Because God sees all the flock of Christ as one. But few men (if any) in those days saw that the true Church is one, and that these two separate Churches were only halves (or less) of the one Church.

3. The Western Church was now very strong and took little or no notice of the East. The Pope of Rome increased his power, and tried more and more to dominate. This seemed to most men the best thing for the Church. They forgot Christ's warning that we must not try to lord it over one another. The attempt at domination went on for five centuries, and then there was a great explosion in the 16th century. We call it the . . . Reformation. [*Draw a line on the map marking off the Protestant countries.*] France was prevented from becoming Protestant by horrible persecutions, which began in the 13th century. Spain was under the Inquisition. Persecution was tried in England also, but it failed. You can't persuade Englishmen by force.

4. The Reformation was a great struggle for freedom; but it was weakened by exaggerations, by more divisions, by persecutions and religious wars. Also this democratic movement was captured by the Kings and Princes. In England the Bishops and the Kings (and the Queen) tried to force the Church services on the Puritans. More domination! And the result again was more freedom—and more division.

III.—Domination

So, you see, the chief cause of division has been domination—despotism. Quarrels about doctrine, also, about opinions and about customs [*e.g. about unleavened bread in the* 11*th century*]; but really at bottom it has been the desire for domination that caused divisions. Liberty had to be won. Now we have got liberty, and have to try and clear away the mess that all the long struggles have made. It has been just the same with nations as with the Church: the attempt of one nation to dominate over another led to war after war. If they had been content to live sensibly together, there would be a United States of Europe to-day, as there is already a United States of America.

Strange that the Churches would not listen to Christ! What had he said?

> "The Kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them; and they that have authority over them are called 'Benefactors' [*there was irony here*]. But ye shall not be so." [*Lk.* 22^{25}.]

And on another occasion:

> "Call no man your Father on the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master even the Christ." [*Mt.* 23^{9}.]

Well, Christians did call men "father." Patriarch means father, and Pope means father; even in England, bishops still have the old official title of fathers in God, though perhaps no authorities are more free from the dominating spirit than they; monks are called "father," and some people even speak of a parish priest as Father Fiddleback, or whatever his name is. This alone shows how curiously the words of Christ have been disregarded. He warned his followers not to exercise domination, but they did, all the same. And what a mess they made of it! [*He warned them also not to recognise even paternal authority in matters of conscience, and though the modern father is far gentler than the ancient, yet he does still exercise a strong and necessary power of domination, which would be wrong in the case of adults.*]

IV.—How to Help

So at the present day we are all sectarians. All the Churches are sects, including the Church of Rome, which is very large and well organised, but cannot keep its hold even in Roman Catholic countries. (It is declining in numbers in every country in the world.) Besides that Church, there are the Eastern Churches, the Anglican Churches, the Lutheran Church, the Presbyterian Churches, and the Churches on a Congregational basis. These are the main divisions.

There are still some people who say, "You can't be saved unless you belong to my Church." (Of course they call their Church *the* Church.) But if you answer, "Am I damned, then?" they generally try to get out of it. This notion that people are not saved unless they belong to a particular society is a relic of barbarism, and is the opposite to the teaching of our Lord. He taught that people are saved by loving God, avoiding evil, and being kind to other people.

These schisms or divisions are not our fault. At least they are not, if we do nothing to continue the schismatic party spirit. If we are just and tolerant to other people, and friendly, we shall be helping to bring the Church together again. We should avoid parties, when people herd together and think everybody is wrong but themselves. Above all, there are two things to remember:

1. Never attack other Churches, and at the same time don't let others attack your Church. Never treat other Christians as outsiders.

2. Never try to proselytise, as the Pharisees did [*Mt.* 23[15]]. This is extraordinarily important; for as soon as Churches cease to try and capture one another's members, a new spirit of friendliness grows up [*e.g. between the Anglican and Eastern Churches*].

[*We can at the present day establish relations of fellowship with both the Eastern and the Protestant Churches; but sometimes Roman Catholics attack us. Our difficulty then is not over differences of belief—we have great differences also with other Churches—but over the fact that proselytism*

makes a state of warfare. We have to ward off blows, but we need not return them; and our best defence is to preserve our own character both in thought and in externals, avoiding Roman ceremonial, keeping free from unreal theological conventions, following the teaching of Christ, and in all things seeking the truth and maintaining a sense of proportion.]

V.—Friendliness

People used to think that each country could have only one Church in it, and that everybody in England must belong to the Church of England. But with modern travel and emigration this has become an impossible idea. In America there are millions of German Lutherans, Polish Roman Catholics, and Greeks and Russians of the Eastern Church; and there is really no Church of America. In England too there are Greek and Russian Churches. We don't say they ought to belong to us: we are friends with them, and help them, and even lend them churches to worship in. If we attacked them, or tried to proselytise, we should be hopelessly divided from them; but, as it is, we are not very far from reunion with them.

I think there will always be different Churches like that—at least for a long time to come—even in the same town. I don't see how we can help it. But if everyone is friendly, if nobody tries to find fault or to proselytise, then the different Churches will come closer and closer together, till they are in communion together, and all form parts of one united Church.

We have discovered that this is possible with nations. Once England tried to dominate over the American colonies. Result, division: the U.S.A. separated from us. Then we gave up domination. Now our colonies have freedom: Canada, Australia, &c., are self-governing nations—the "Five Nations." But they are more united with us than ever [*e.g. the Great War*]. The British Empire is a great federation of free nations. Some day we may hope that the Catholic Church will be

a greater [and more intimate] federation of free Churches. [*The federal idea is the nearest we can get.*] The separate Churches exist, though the Church of Christ is one Church. We can make them more friendly, till they are in communion together.

This is not so remote and impossible as you may think. The early Church consisted of self-governing Churches united together: the Eastern Church has never changed, and the Churches of Greece, Russia, Serbia, Rumania, &c., are still self-governing Churches in communion together. The Anglican Churches are the same; there are ten Churches, in England, Ireland, Scotland, America, and the Dominions, besides many missionary dioceses. They are all free and self-governing, but they are all in union together.

Federation [*to use this modern word*] was the secret of the early Church: it has never been lost in the Eastern Church. Federation, based on democracy, is the secret of the United States, and of the British Empire; and it is the system also of the Anglican Church.

78

THE MINISTRY OF THE CHURCH

[*The subject of the ministry is a delicate one, owing to the atmosphere of controversy with which it is still surrounded. The Teacher will naturally give his own view, and say with all fairness and moderation what he believes to be true; and many who make use of this book will not agree with everything that is stated in this Lesson. But the writer offers it as a humble example of what a teacher may say who is really trying to explain what he believes to be the truth; and he is one of those who think that many of our historic difficulties are due to our not having laid sufficient stress upon the silence of Christ about the question of Orders, or upon the freedom with which the subject is treated when it is mentioned in the New Testament. Others may take a different view, but yet the writer would urge that no successful appeal can be made to the young if it is based upon technicalities, or upon controversies in which the young are happily not interested.*

Therefore he has tried to take what may be roughly called a common-sense view, and has not tried to argue on technical grounds which are not understood even by the adult public. But he would like to draw attention to the wise tolerance with which the historic position of the Catholic Church is put forward in the Lambeth Report on Reunion issued by the Anglican bishops in 1920. *The Report guards against the danger on the one side of acquiescing in the existence of rival Churches, and, on the other, of unchurching those whose position seems to be defective. The Catholic Church itself according to God's will is not fully manifested to-day. The use of the word "Churches" is a crucial point when applied to those bodies which the Report generally calls "Non-episcopal*

Communions," and on p. 30 "Non-episcopal Churches." To call them Churches seems to some people to acquiesce in our present anarchical condition; to avoid calling them Churches seems to be discourteous, not to say untrue. There is even a prejudice against the use at all of the plural, "the Churches," in some sections of Anglican thought, which would be cured if all Anglicans were familiar with the deacon's prayer in the Orthodox Eastern Liturgies, "for all the holy Churches of God." But some who do not share this prejudice still wish "the Churches" to be confined to those which are episcopal. The writer believes that the word should be used as freely as possible, though without prejudice (in the legal sense), partly because he thinks that great harm is done by over-subtle distinctions, and partly because the reunion of Christendom can only come through the use of the most charitable methods and the most courteous terms possible. He thinks that these two reasons apply specially to the teaching of the young, but he does not wish to imply that the question of episcopacy is a matter of indifference. And he apologises for the length of this note!]

I.—Bishops

THE Church, we said last time, is broken up by many divisions which came about in past ages—and some indeed are arising now, and others may arise in the future. So we have got to be careful—very charitable, and just, and intelligent. New ideas come along; and if the Church does not understand them and tries to put them down, new sects are formed. Divisions are wrong in principle, because they are against the mind of Christ: they are also wrong in practice, because instead of being "like a mighty army," the Church is like an army with its regiments running about in different directions, and some of them fighting one another.

One of the chief causes of our divisions has been the question of the Ministry, *i.e.* the clergy. It seems strange that the Church should fall to pieces over this question; but so it is. Millions of Christians say,

"You can't belong to the true Church unless you have a particular kind of minister." Many Anglicans think that without bishops any Church, however good or great, is a mere schismatic sect; and all Roman Catholics think that no one can belong to the true Church unless he belongs to the Bishop of Rome, the Pope.

Now while we are content with condemning others we can never have unity in the Church. Bishops are made into a cause of disunion, when they ought to be a cause of union. And to lay an exaggerated stress upon bishops must, one would think, be against the mind of Christ; because he never said anything about them at all.

II.—Exaggeration

The Church ought to have bishops. She has always (or nearly always) had bishops, and we cannot have a reunited Church without them. Most people are coming to see that.

But we must not *exaggerate* the importance of bishops. If we do, we only do harm, and destroy the very thing that bishops are for—the unity and order of the Church. That is very important, because many good people who have worked and prayed for unity have at the same time spoilt much of their work by this exaggeration.

If you say, "An army ought to have lieutenant-generals," most people will agree with you. But if you say, "No army can exist without lieutenant-generals," some will disagree. And if there happens to be an army without lieutenant-generals, what then? The French army has no lieutenant-generals; but you would not say that therefore it is not a true army. [*This is true of other ranks also; e.g. before the War, the rank of marshal was in abeyance in France.*] If you said this to a Frenchman, naturally there would be trouble.

That is what I mean by exaggeration. It is true to say that the ministry of the old historic churches consists of bishops and priests, and of some lower ranks. And this is the position of the Church of England. But it is unnecessary to say that a church without bishops is not

a true church but a mere troublesome schismatic sect. If you said this to a Presbyterian, naturally there would be trouble.

So, if we want union, we must not exaggerate, and we must not deny. Affirm as much as you like, but don't deny. And, above all, don't deny other people's existence. It only makes them angry.

III.—The Church in the N.T.

It is the Church that comes first, not its officers. It is a Church that exists; it does not owe its existence to its ministers—they owe their existence to it. The army exists: it does not owe its existence to its generals, and colonels, and majors—they exist because there is an army. The Creed does not say, "I believe in bishops and priests," but . . .

In the New Testament there is none of this exaggeration—this putting the cart before the horse. Our Lord founded a mighty brotherhood, which we call the Church, but there is nothing in his teaching about its ministers. Nor did the Apostles, so far as we know, lay down any laws about what exact orders of ministers there were to be; both Episcopalians and Presbyterians believe that they are carrying out the Apostles' methods. At the same time there is no exaggeration on the other side; the Apostles did not say, "It doesn't matter about order." In the N.T. Church there is always order, and ministers are appointed by the laying on of hands. At first there are different kinds of ministers; but there always seems to be one chief kind—they are called "elders." The Greek for "elder" or "older man" is πρεσβύτερος, *presbyterus*; and "presbyter" got to be shortened into our word "priest." So "priest," "presbyter" and "elder" are the same thing.

The elders had a chairman, and he became the bishop. Early in the 2nd century we find bishops in our sense of the word. So bishops are a very ancient institution: about this all scholars agree [*though it doesn't all work out so simply as it appears in the hymn "Christ is gone up"*].

IV.—In Later Times

During the first four centuries, people understood that the Church made the bishops, and not the bishops the Church. The bishop is elected by the local church; he acts with the consent of his Church. His election is confirmed by other bishops, who consecrate him. Thus he is not an autocrat, but derives his authority from the Church and is dependent on the Church. As time goes on, he becomes more important, and some bishops are much more important than others. So gradually the place of the bishops in the Church becomes exaggerated. Especially the chief bishops of the great sees (Rome, Antioch, &c.) have become very important—they are called "fathers" (patriarchs and popes) as I said last time. This was useful in many ways, for those were turbulent and half-barbarous times—emperors fell and barbarians streamed over Europe—and some authority was needed. But in the long run the domination led (as we said last time) to disunion. The office of bishop had been exaggerated, and at the Reformation new churches arose which did without bishops altogether.

V.—The Apostolic Succession

The Apostolic Succession means that the bishops are the successors of the Apostles. It does not mean that the Apostles laid their hands on the first bishops, and they on the next bishops, and so on, in an unbroken chain down to the present day. That is a mechanical—almost a magical idea—which seems to have been invented about a hundred years ago. The true doctrine is that the Church has gone on all the time, and has always had its officers; and that the chief officers do the work of the Apostles and take the place of the Apostles. The present officers are therefore the successors of the first officers. But if all the bishops were killed to-day the Church would not cease to exist just because there were no bishops left to consecrate new ones. The Church would appoint new bishops, and *they* would be the successors of the Apostles. It is rather like an old

school; the school has gone on all the time and has always had masters; it has changed in many ways, but has always been the same school, and its masters to-day are the successors of the original masters, and do their work.

[*In technical language, the Apostolic Succession is not a succession through a channel of transmitted grace. The mechanical chain idea, so widely current in Anglican circles, has not been traced in the Fathers, and was not mentioned by the Council of Trent. Although the bishop's office was exaggerated in the Middle Ages, and ceased to be constitutional, the transmission theory was not held. The subject can be followed up in Bishop Headlam's "Doctrine of the Church," esp. pp.* 103–129. *It seems necessary to say something about it, because much harm is still being done. But in some places it may be necessary to lay stress on the other side—the importance of order, and of the historic ministry.*]

VI.—The Threefold Ministry

It is necessary to have order in the Church. It is also necessary to have order in the State. If you exaggerate the order and make it despotic, then it breaks down, and there is an explosion, as at the Reformation; or, in the State, when Charles I. was killed or James II. driven out. The explosion comes sooner or later. Russia went on as a despotism much longer than France, but the explosion was worse when it came at last in 1917. But order you must have. It is easy to destroy it—as a child can knock over something you have carefully built up—but very difficult to make it. The barbarians knocked over the old order of the Roman Empire; the Church, under enormous difficulties, built up a finer and better order.

The historic order of the Church is called holy order, and when a man enters the ancient ministry he is said to take holy orders.

The three chief orders of the ministry are bishops, priests, and deacons. In pictures (and sometimes in

real life!) you can distinguish them by the dress they wear.

1. The word *bishop* is shortened from ἐπίσκοπος, *episcopus*, which means "an overseer." The bishop wears a mitre. He ordains others to the ministry, confirms, consecrates churches, and manages the diocese, in addition to the things which a priest does.

2. The word *priest* is shortened from πρεσβύτερος, *presbyterus*, which means "an elder." The priest wears a chasuble. He celebrates the Holy Communion, and pronounces the Absolution and the Blessing, in addition to those things which a deacon does.

3. The word *deacon* is shortened from διάκονος, *diaconus*, which means "a servant." The deacon wears a dalmatic. He helps the priest, and in the Eastern Churches he sings a great part of the service; he is less important with us, because he generally passes on to the priesthood. (There are exceptions to this: Mr. Dodgson, the author of *Alice in Wonderland*, was an Oxford don, and always remained a deacon.) The deacon helps at Holy Communion, reads the Gospel, and administers the chalice. He also can baptise, preach, and take most services except the actual celebration of the Communion Service.

There are also minor orders, such as the sub-deacon, or the clerk who read the Epistle. But they have varied a good deal, and I won't trouble you with them.

[*There is perhaps not a good hymn on this subject, E.H.* 167 *being rather too specialised. Most* 19*th century hymns were acutely individualistic, and hymns that were about the Church tended to be prosy, like* 489. *Some more modern hymns, like* 464, 375, *and that already mentioned,* 488, *are really good poetry;* 472 *is simple and appealing, but the popular* 643 *is only true in the least obvious sense.* 506 *is good, but the last two verses are misleading and should be omitted.*]

79

PROPORTION

[*This will probably need two Lessons.*]

I.—Degrees of Importance

WE have been saying so much about exaggeration that I am going to give you to-day a Lesson on Proportion. This means not exaggerating one thing at the expense of another, but keeping things their right size, in relation to one another. For instance, a man's body is about seven times as long as his head; but if you draw a man with his body ten times as long as his head, that is out of proportion. Or if you draw a man with his head as large as his body, like a pigmy in a pantomime, the head may be quite accurately done, and the body also, but they are not in the right proportion, and the result is not a man but a monster.

People are always making this mistake in religion, and in other forms of thought. Want of proportion has led to all sorts of mistakes, quarrels and persecutions. Heresy is really a want of proportion. The united Church in the old days was constantly striving to prevent exaggeration, and orthodoxy was the result of a sense of proportion.

When people are not very large-minded they so easily think that, because a thing is important, it must be *most* important—and so they let it swallow up everything else.

For instance. Red is an important colour. If you are painting the portrait of your sister, you will want some red in the lips and cheeks. But if you say, "What a fine colour! I will dab some red on the nose—I will paint the whole face crimson—well, you will have lost your sense of proportion, and your sister will not be pleased.

Yet that is what happens in religion. A hundred years ago most English people thought the salvation of their souls so important that they forgot about the Church. They exaggerated the individual side, and minimised the social side. Then after a time some people exaggerated the Church. They treated it as an end in itself, and forgot that it is a means—indeed, not an end but a beginning. I remember hearing a man say of a certain parson, "He's always preaching about the Church and the clergy! Why doesn't he preach the Gospel!"

And when such people talked about the Church, they generally meant the ministry (bishops and priests)—the ministry got out of all proportion. That is why we are trying to put it back into its proper place! It *is* important, but the Church is more important; yet most books about the Church in the last fifty years have been really about the ministry and have said little about the Church itself [*e.g. Bishop Paget's essay in "Lux Mundi"*].

II.—Secondary Things

And people *quarrel* about the *secondary* things, *i.e.* the less important things. And because they are quarrelled about, and controversial, people get to think them still more important! And the religious papers are full of them, and people talk as if there were nothing else.

And the curious thing is this: Christ spoke clearly about the really important things in religion—*e.g.* about forgiving, and about being charitable. So Christians don't disagree (much) about them. But they disagree about the things which he did not mention. And he did not mention them because he did not think them worth disagreeing about!

In the case of the ministry, this is still more strange, because the Apostles also thought the ministry of secondary importance. They made no rules; they just created any ministers they thought necessary, such as

prophets, elders, "servants" (deacons), evangelists; they did not settle the future government of the Church. The N.T. Church had not bishops in our sense of the word. And Catholics, Presbyterians, and others have quarrelled about episcopacy, just because the Apostles did not worry about it and laid down no rules. How sensible of the Apostles! They left the Church to arrange whatever it found most useful. They had not heard of the Pope. They were not "Episcopalians." The Early Church carried on in the Apostles' way, and developed the ministry as circumstances required. How sensible of the Early Church! It was not Presbyterian, or Congregationalist, or Anglican, or Roman. It was just sensible. And it soon produced bishops, because it wanted them.

III.—Charity

So you may rightly say, Bishops are important;
If you remember that, The Church is more important.
And you may rightly say, The Church is important;
If you remember that, Charity is the most important thing in the world.

And if everybody had remembered *that*, there would have been no divisions, and heaven would have come on earth by now!

So never be afraid of being friendly to other kinds of Christians. And if people cry out "You are breaking the rules, and we ought not to be friendly," you can reply, "Charity is of much more importance than your rules; and the teaching of Christ is of much more importance than the customs of men." I knew an English soldier during the War who wanted to make his confession in a village in France, and the French priest heard him and gave him absolution, though it was against the rules. And I knew an Anglican priest during the War who celebrated the Holy Communion in a Scottish Women's Hospital, where all, save one, were Presbyterians. He had to put the law of Christ in its right proportion, above everything else.

IV.—Order of Importance

But we mustn't go off into the question of rules. Proportion is what we are thinking of. You get the right order in the Creed itself:

1. God the Father Almighty.
2. Jesus Christ and his life.
3. The work of the Holy Spirit.
4. The Church.

And you might go on:

5. What the Church does.
6. What the Church believes.
7. Whom the Church employs.
8. What clothes they wear.

Thirty years ago it was No. 7 [*the chasuble, &c.*] that nearly tore the English Church in half. And No. 7 [*it was the surplice then*] was one of the main causes of the Puritan struggle in the 17th century, and of the splitting up of the Church in England.

V.—The Need of Proportion

I have said so much about this, because lies are the curse of the earth; and lies come not so much from deliberate untruth as from exaggeration, and want of proportion, which are often due to sheer prejudice, ignorance, and stupidity.

The Church has paid a terrible price for past mistakes. As an institution she is still weak and divided. We want to make her great and beautiful and strong again. We shall never do that if we exaggerate the lesser things and put the second things first. The world will simply laugh at us, if we say, "Ours is the only true Church and everybody else is wrong." Wise men will take no notice of us if we make a fuss about secondary things. As it is, millions of Christian people in Europe and America stand outside the Church (though they really belong to it), because they are disgusted by the arrogance and exclusiveness and want of proportion that they have too often seen.

But as the Churches turn back to Christ, the whole world will listen; for all good people love the character of Christ and his teaching. And turning back to Christ means teaching what he taught, and not trying to insist that everybody shall agree with us about things which he did not mention.

Such things may be important, and they often are. Even clothes are important. The notes of music are important, but they only become important when they are in relation one to another. [*Someone sounds one or two notes separately. . . . Then plays a melody.*] Now they are related together, some short and some long. [*He plays the harmonies alone.*] Something is wrong: the most important part—the melody—is missing. [*He plays melody and harmony together.*] Now all is right; everything is in its right proportion, and so it is all in harmony. Yet that tune is only part of a great symphony; and the symphony is yet more important than the tune.

So, if we believe in the Holy Catholic Church we shall put Christ first, and the love and charity of Christ before all lesser things. Then we shall all be sensible and friendly, and the Church will be cleansed, defended, and united, and will be far greater and more glorious than it ever has been before.

The organised Churches are not as large, all put together, as Christendom, because many people stand outside the Churches at the present day. But *the* Church *is* as large as Christendom: it is the whole company of Christian people.

VI.—A Baby

"But will it?" you say. "The Church is very old—nearly two thousand years, and it ought to have got right by now."

No the Church is not old. That is the mistake. Do have some sense of proportion! She is still very young—a mere infant, tumbling about because she has not learnt to walk properly. And how tiny children quarrel! Quarrelling is a sign of extreme youth.

Look at this piece of paper. [*T. produces a small strip.*] It is two inches long. Each inch represents a thousand years. That is about the age of the Church.

Now look at this. [*T. produces a strip 5 inches long, with 2 inches marked off.*] That represents the time from the beginning of the Bronze Age to the present day, about 5000 years: 5 inches. The Church is beginning to look young! Now look at this [*produces a tape 37 inches long, (or a yard measure) with 2 inches marked off; an assistant holds it out*]. This represents the time from the beginning of the Reindeer Age to the present day, about 36 or 37,000 years. Men were sufficiently civilised 37,000 years ago to make well-shaped [*later Palaeolithic*] stone implements, and even carve pictures and little statues. How young the Church looks—2 inches out of a yard!

But we must go further. [*T. and the assistant hold a piece of string 42 feet long, with 2 inches marked off by white tape.*] The Geologists tell us that men were making stone implements [*Early Palaeolithic*] in the First Glacial Age, about 500,000 years ago: 500 inches, over 42 feet. *The Church is young indeed!*

The Church is very young, still at the beginning of her great career.

THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH

[*If T. is fond of history, he will find this outline swelling into more than one Lesson.*]

I.—Halves and Quarters

WE said last time that the Church of Christ is very young—less than 2 inches high! She has had a very difficult and stormy history. Indeed you might say that most of her life she has been struggling with the barbarians. People have an idea that after the age of the martyrs was over, the Church just converted Europe easily and quickly. This is quite wrong. The conversion of Europe was a much slower business than is the conversion of India or China to-day—far slower.

I wonder if I can give you an idea? Not a lot of history, but a rough bird's eye view. [*Two blackboards, if possible; one an outline map of Europe and W. Asia, with a red line E. of Poland and Hungary and through the Adriatic. The other as follows:*—]

Early.	100	Obscurity or Persecution till— 313, Constantine. 400, Barbarians begin.
Middle Ages.	500	—Byzantine (East). More invasions.
	1000—	—End of Barbarianism.
	1500	—The Reformation.
Modern.	1900	—To-day.

There is the 2000 years (roughly) divided into halves and quarters.

1st Quarter, to A.D. 500*: Persecution. The Barbarians begin.*

The age of Persecution ended during the first quarter, in 313. But by the end of that century the Barbarians were coming across the Danube from their wild forests in Germany. The mighty Roman Empire was breaking up. They came pouring over for centuries—Goths of different kinds, Vandals, Lombards, Franks, Burgundians, Anglo-Saxons. They burnt Rome down several times, and spread over Europe. The Church had to save the world from these powerful savages. Gradually she converted them and tamed them. In 450 a more horrible invasion happened: the terrible Huns came from Asia. At last they were defeated.

2nd Quarter, A.D. 500–1000*: The East. More Invasions*

By the end of our first quarter, the last Roman Emperor had disappeared [*Romulus Augustulus*, 476]. The Middle Ages began. There were now only Emperors in the East, at Constantinople [*till Charlemagne*, 800]: so we have put the word "Byzantine," which means "of Constantinople." There were some great Byzantine Emperors [*Justinian*, 527–65].

Then a still more terrible thing happened [*Hejira*, 622]: Muhammad arose, and his followers destroyed Christianity wherever they could, with the sword. The Eastern Church has never recovered from this. Until the rise of Islam, the Eastern Church was larger than the Western, and there were Churches as far as Persia, and further, and one in India which still exists. North Africa, again, had once had between 600 and 700 bishoprics. The Muslims even conquered Spain and held most of it for about seven hundred years. Constantinople held out, and was the great centre of learning and art through the Middle Ages. But Constantinople fell at last in 1453, and the Turks pushed as far as the

walls of Vienna. The Church had consisted of 5 great Patriarchates (churches under a patriarch)—Antioch, Alexandria, Rome, Constantinople, Jerusalem. But all these Patriarchates were taken by the followers of Muhammad, except Rome. (This and the fall of the Roman Empire were the chief reasons for the great power of the Bishop of Rome.) [*Map.*]

Still the barbarians came on. You have all heard of the Vikings or Danes. After the Anglo-Saxons had been converted, the Vikings came and brought heathenism again [*c.* 800–*c.* 1000]: they went conquering and destroying everywhere—France, Sicily, even through Russia. [*Map.*] If you had been living about 950, you would have seen the enemies of Christ tightening their grip on all sides—Vikings, Hungarians, Saracens, and it would have seemed as if Christianity must be smothered.

All this time, the Church had been struggling heroically to convert and civilise the barbarians, who had come, wave after wave, to cover the whole of Europe. [*The Turks finished the process. By the 15th century all Europe had been over-run at some time or other. Even Ireland had been raided by the Danes.*] Especially the monks, who settled down peaceably in desolate forests, cultivated the land and tamed the people.

3rd Quarter, A.D. 1000–1500: *Settlement*

You may take the year 1000 (about) as the time when the barbarians were finally converted in the West, even the Vikings. About half-way in our history, then, civilisation had a chance to begin again. And it did begin. Western Europe settled down at last: a noble art was established, learning spread, and the great period of the later Middle Ages began.

But there was no peace in the East and South. Spain was to remain under the Moors for more than 4 centuries longer. The Huns continued to devastate Asia; and in the 13th century some Hun tribes, the Tartars [*Batu,*

1238], conquered Russia and the E. half of Europe [*it was nearly half*], and they held Russia for two more centuries. [*Map.*]

Last Quarter, A.D. 1500–1900*: Modern Era*

What a history! The wonder is that any civilisation survived at all. What a task for the young Church, and how wonderfully she has accomplished it! Not till our last quarter [*Board*] has civilisation been secure, and the Church triumphant. (By the Church of course I mean the whole of Christendom.) By 1500 the Moors were driven out of Spain, and the Tartars out of Russia: all the old barbarian invaders (like Anglo-Saxons and Danes in England) had been long converted, and had gradually become very civilised. Yet even then the Turks held a large part of Europe, and it was not till about 1800 that it was certain their power was declining. Now they are almost out of Europe; and they ought not to be in Constantinople.

Then the Reformation struggles came, and more division. But knowledge and civilisation took great strides forward. The world has become cleverer, wiser, and less cruel in modern times.

People often look back and say, "The Church did this or that cruel thing," or "The Church was ignorant and benighted." But they forget that the Church consisted of barbarians who had only been converted some generations before, and had not learnt to behave entirely as Christians. Converted Europe was only learning to live in a Christian way. We are still learning! We are rather like a converted cannibal at a dinner-party, dressed in a tail-coat and feathers, who has learnt that he mustn't knock the servants on the head, but grabs the food out of his neighbour's plate and throws the pudding at the butler.

II.—The Conversion of Europe

Would you like to have an idea of what a long time it took to convert Europe at all—before the civilising could even begin? Look at the map.

2nd & 3rd cent.		Church growing secretly in Syria, Greece, Rome, N. Africa.
6th	,,	Franks converted (France).
6th & 7th	,,	Anglo-Saxons converted.
8th	,,	West Germany converted by Boniface.
10th & 11th	,,	Russians converted.
,,	,,	Vikings ,,
,,	,,	Poland ,,
11th	,,	Norway ,,
10th & 12th	,,	Sweden ,,
12th & 13th	,,	Finns ,,
13th	,,	Prussians ,,
14th	,,	Lithuanians ,,

So it took nearly three-quarters of our 2000 years to convert Europe. Indeed there are some Samoyede tribes in Russia who have not been converted even yet. Central Europe (including Poland and Kiev, was converted by 1000; but Scandinavia and the East Baltic lands were not altogether Christianised till about 1400. This belt of paganism between the Eastern and Western Churches had a profound effect, and did much to keep them separate.

And just when the conversion of Europe was finished, the Turks were conquering Europe from the Black Sea to the Adriatic! [*The line includes Rumania, Hungary, Bosnia, Albania, Greece.*]

What a long and fearful struggle! Missionary work to-day is easy compared with it.

Why is missionary work easier now? Because since 1000, when the barbarians were tamed. Christendom has been becoming more and more strong and civilised; and during our last quarter (1500–19...) Christendom has been leading the whole world because of its knowledge, civilisation and higher moral standard.

People know so little about all these things. They

will read cheap novels, and newspapers that are full of race horses and cricket! So they don't understand the really necessary things. That is why there is so much confusion about Church and International matters, and so much foolishness talked. People are just muddled.

During the War, in a munition factory, there were some casks which it was very important should he kept upside down. So they put up a notice, "As it is most important that these casks should be kept upside down, the tops must be labelled bottom." So confusing! We are always muddling one another like that.

III.—The Spread of Christianity

I hope you understand a little now, anyhow. The Church—the whole of Christendom—has grown through all its struggles into immense power. Here are some figures from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. [*This might be illustrated by a string, 57 inches long, 1 inch for 10 millions. Or it can be drawn roughly in squares on the black-board*]:—

In A.D. 300 there were about 5 million Christians.

400	,,	,,	,,	10	,,	,,
800	,,	,,	,,	30	,,	,,
1000	,,	,,	,,	50	,,	,,
1500	,,	,,	,,	100	,,	,,
1800	,,	,,	,,	200	,,	,,
1880	,,	,,	,,	410	,,	,,
1900	,,	,,	,,	500	,,	,,
1915	,,	,,	,,	571	,,	,,

So there is nothing to be discouraged about! In modern times the civilisation of the Church has given it enormously increasing power. It is reckoned that—

In 1786, 313 million people out of 961 million were under Christian government, 36 per cent.

In 1915, 1095 million out of 1613 million were under Christian government, 68 per cent.

In 1600, 7 per cent. of the earth (3,480,900 square miles) was under Christian government.

In 1915, 94½ per cent. of the earth (46,400,000 square miles) was under Christian government.

Thus the influence of the Church has increased even more than its membership—from 36 per cent. in 1786 to 68 per cent. in 1915 of the population. And when you look at the map of the world you can try and remember that in Queen Elizabeth's reign only $\frac{1}{15}$ of the land was under Christian government, and in 1915 only $\frac{1}{18}$ was left outside: $94\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., or $\frac{17}{18}$ had passed into Christian hands: and it is rather more to-day.

81

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

I WONDER if I can give you any idea about the Church of England and the whole Anglican Communion in this short time? Let us try hard. To get our proportion right, we have our 2000 years (about) divided into halves and quarters again. Thus [*black-board*]:—

	British Church.
500	—Angles and Saxons.
	„ „ converted.
1000	—Triumph of the Medieval
First great Division	Church.
1500	—The Reformation.
Second great Division	
1900	—Modern Times.

1st Quarter: British Church and Heathen Invasions

There was an ancient British Church in the first Quarter, in the days of the ancient Romans; as early as *c.* 200, and a Christian basilica or church of the 3rd century was discovered a few years ago at Silchester near Reading. But in 500 the heathen Angles and Saxons were conquering Britain [449–*c.* 590]. The land became savage again.

2nd Quarter, A.D. 500–1000*: The English Church, The Danes*

Soon after 500, many good and brave men began to convert the Anglo-Saxons. S. Columba came from Ireland to Scotland [563], with his monks, and their influence began to spread southward. The year he died [597] S. Augustine arrived on the South Coast, and

converted Kent. He was sent by a very great man, Pope Gregory the Great, who had been touched, 12 years before, by seeing the child-slaves, "Angles," in the slave market at Rome. Other missionaries worked up from the south, and down from the north, till in 150 years the whole of Britain was converted [664].

Then [793], when the new English Church had just settled down, came the invasions—one after the other—of the Viking Danes. More savage heathens! Alfred, King of Wessex, the noblest of kings, resisted them successfully [?900], but they destroyed civilisation in the north completely. And they came again. So ends the first half of our Church history, in misery and confusion.

3rd Quarter, A.D. 1000–1500: *Triumph of the Church*

Then came the settlement, which you remember happened everywhere in Western Europe about the year 1000. The Danish King, Canute [1017–35], was converted. Soon after, came William the Conqueror. A telephone clerk was once asked his date, and he replied: "Hastings, One O double six." Quite easy!

So begins the great period of the Church's power, from the Norman Conquest to the Reformation. Hildebrand, the greatest of the Popes, made the Papacy a mighty power in the Western Church, and this helped to civilise and subdue the turbulent, still half-barbarian rulers—kings, dukes, counts; for there were no real nations, but only quarrelsome landlords of large or small countries or provinces at first. But nations grew up during this 3rd Quarter; and there was an Emperor also who was always quarrelling with the Pope. During this period the Popes did much good work in keeping the world in order, but they sought too much *domination*; and after a while their power began to decline. Also new doctrines and rules were made; the doctrine of transubstantiation (1215), for instance, and the rule that the clergy must not marry. And already [1098] the Eastern and Western Churches were separated.

This Quarter (1000–1500) was the period of the

Church's outward and visible triumph. The last of the barbarians were brought in; the world settled down to learn and improve. The Church was united under the Pope—as far as Poland, Hungary, and Italy (and nobody bothered about the Eastern Church beyond). Practically everybody went to Church and received the Sacraments, and belonged to the same great organised Church. Western Europe was covered with our glorious churches and cathedrals—Romanesque and Gothic; and art was greater and more lovely than it had ever been before.

We can get one glimpse of all this through the Guilds. They were the Trade Unions of the time, and wonderfully successful, because they had a religious basis—each generally with its own chapel and services. They insisted on honesty among their members, and fair prices, and a high standard of workmanship—so high that the things they made are now regarded as among the most precious in the world. They prevented profiteering and sweating, and they trained the boys as apprentices. Think of their festivals. Not an ugly procession of shabbily-dressed men, like a Trade Union procession to-day, but altogether glorious and gay. . . . But there isn't time. Think of the finest thing you have ever seen. . . . [*Perhaps some recent example*]. Well, that is a poor thing compared with these old workmen's Guild processions, and plays, and festivities.

There was another side—much ignorance and wickedness in the Church, many cruel tyrants—outcasts, beggars, lepers; slums and filth. But the point is that skilled labour had organised itself on a basis of honesty, beauty, and religious fellowship. What might not have happened if all this medieval system had only gone on improving, instead of breaking down?

4th Quarter, A.D. 1500–1900: *The Reformation, Modern Times*

In our last Quarter all was changed. The old system did break down. It is no good blaming the Reformation which developed during the reigns of Henry VIII.,

Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth, or modern science nationalism, or industrialism. If the old system had not had some weakness in its very heart, it would have developed and not have broken down. That weakness was the spirit of domination. It had not mastered the idea of liberty; it was not sufficiently tolerant, charitable, or ready to learn and to improve. So the inevitable struggle for liberty took the horrible forms of war, destruction, and persecution. The medieval Church would not reform herself, would not go back to the teaching of Christ. So reform came from outside.

The great principle of civilised society—above everything else in practical importance—is liberty; not domination, but liberation, not repression, but education. The world had to learn this (just as we have learnt it at school—not flogging boys into submission, but educating them, drawing them out). Sooner or later it had to come,—the nasty explosion! The working-classes suffered; the Guilds were robbed and suppressed. The Reformers (and in England still more, their successors, the Puritans) destroyed most of the incalculable beauty of the Middle Ages, and set the world rocking in civil war. They did not after all really get back to Christ, but taught Calvinism and other forms of Christianity which were sometimes more mistaken than the old. They often went back to Moses—which was too far back. But they did make it possible for people to read the Bible, and therein to see what Christ had actually taught. They did strike for freedom, and that with heroic courage. And though they sometimes persecuted others, they were a considerable improvement on the unreformed Church, which has had a bad streak of ferocious cruelty. England never forgot the burning of Mary's reign or the Inquisition.

The modern world had to come; and it has brought enormous improvements. With all the faults of the modern world none of us really want to go back to the Middle Ages. But it came in a violent way, because it was not properly helped and welcomed. It broke up the organised Church of the West.

We are living in the Reformation period still, and we see all its confusion around us. The Church has not yet settled down again. Man has not yet reconciled religious freedom with religious unity. But Christ has shown us the way; and when we listen to him we shall settle it all by charity. Love is the fulfilling of the law. Then, when all the Churches have given up hatred, arrogance, exclusiveness, and narrow dogmatism, the triumphant Church of the Middle Ages will be realised again, and this time without that weak spot in its heart. When all the Churches insist upon the things of Christ, and upon nothing else, then all good men will come together again in one Church, more Catholic than before. [*The hymn, "O Faith of England," E.H.* 544, *is very appropriate here. But it would have to be well done.*]

The Church of England

The Church in England is at present divided into many sects. Every Christian in England belongs to the Church in England, because he was baptised into the Church and not into a sect.

You know the names of some of these Churches—Congregationalist, Baptist, Methodist. But do not forget that there is an enormous number of people who do not go to church at all, many of whom do not belong to any religious organisation. The Church of England is supposed to be the Church of the English People, which is the reason why the Prime Minister appoints the Bishops. But this great idea is spoilt, because of our divisions. So let us, to avoid confusion, call it the Anglican Church in England (though some object to this!):

> Anglicans, Nonconformists, and the Unattached together form the real Church of England.
>
> The Church of England will not properly exist till they are united.

At the same time in theory and in law the Anglican Church *is* the Church of England; and everybody knows that C. of E. means the Anglican part of English

Christendom. It is certainly larger than all the others put together, and a great deal more powerful. But all the same we cannot be happy with this position. It is unreal. We want the Church of England to be as big as England, to be the Church of the English People. The other Churches agree with us in wanting to do what Christ taught. So there ought not to be any real difficulty in coming together. There *is*, however, because none of the Churches are yet quite ready to act up to their belief. As soon as we all do act up to this belief that we only want to do what Christ told us to be, then the secondary matters will be easily settled, and there will be a real Church of England again.

Federation

Anglican Churches also exist in other countries. So do the Congregationalist, Methodist, and the other Churches; indeed, in America they are much larger than we are. Do you remember, I said that these many Anglican Churches give us a very good lesson in Church unity [L. 77]? They are all united, and they are all . . . ? free.

That is the only way in which the whole Universal Church can ever be united in one glorious whole. By the different Churches being united and being . . . free; just as we have discovered that you can have a great British Empire because each nation is free, and all are federated together. The Eastern Church, we said (Greece, Russia, Serbia, &c.) has always been a Communion of free self-governing Churches, and so was the Early Church. It is the original Christian method: the early Church discovered the principles of democracy and federation ages before the Nations discovered them. In the barbarian times these great principles were forgotten, and then there came divisions and revolutions. We are still in the confusion. Before the Church is much older (she is so very young!) she will have learnt to build up her life again on the basis of—

1. Democracy. 2. Liberty,

by the method of federation, through the agency of bishops and councils, in the spirit of charity and tolerance, and after the example of our Lord Jesus Christ.

NOTE: THE SCOUT MOVEMENT

If there is a revision here, it will be useful to bring in the Boy Scout and Girl Guide Movement, as promoting fellowship both interdenominational and international. Wise men are looking to the young people to accomplish what statesmen and bishops have failed to achieve in the past—peace; because the will to peace must grow up from below. Two vast movements have developed in the present century, the Student Christian movement and the Scout movement, which in their different ways may bring together both nations and churches in a fellowship new to the history of the world. Although the Scout movement more immediately concerns our audience, it is good for them to hear the Student Movement mentioned also, both in connection with the melancholy failure of the Churches to secure the peace of the world, or even to live in friendship together themselves, and in connection with the Fellowship which is discussed in Lessons 84–6.

The following are extracts from an article in the "Times" by Sir Robert Baden Powell (Aug. 19), *after the International Scout Conferences at Cambridge, Paris and Geneva,* 1922:

"The 'road' alluded to in the International Conference of Boy Scouts as 'leading to a glorious possibility' lies in the direction of international peace training. All men are thirsting for peace; the prosperity and happiness of the whole world are dependent upon it. The Great War has been an object-lesson, bringing directly home to all, with greater insistence than any example in history books, the horrors and evils which warfare brings in its train. But it is not the abolition of armies that will do away with war, any more than the abolition of police will do away with crime. We have to do away with the cause of war. Armies are merely the effect.

"If we are to bring about peace in the world, the way will lie not so much in legislation to control the warlike

propensities of existing Governments as in the will of the peoples for peace. This implies education of the on-coming generation to international good-will. Certain modern nations have retained conscription as much for educative as for war purposes, and to preserve their race from deterioration in its manly qualities. Few will disagree with the feeling that manliness and character must be maintained, but the problem is to devise a method by which it can be done apart from the training of men to war and bloodshed. . . .

"Scouting has this advantage, that it embraces a varied catalogue of sports to meet varied conditions of temperament and climate. It is, intentionally, educative of character, of handcraft, of health, and especially of service. Furthermore, it is as applicable to girls as to boys, and to adolescents of all ages from eight to eighteen. It has already proved its attraction for boys of all countries, from China to Peru. It carries with it, in addition to its educational value, a common ideal, ceremonial, and dress.

"It has grown out of the inner desire of the boy himself. It is thus a natural brotherhood whose members feel themselves bound together by these ties without regard to class, colour, or creed—a league where they have learned to think in terms of friendship towards each other, and where already, by interchange of correspondence and personal visits, they are becoming comrades full of sympathy and mutual understanding."

82

OVERSEA MISSIONS

I.—Missionaries

"OVERSEA Missions" means the work which is done by men and women to spread the teaching of Christ in those parts of the world which are not yet Christian. These men and women are called missionaries. A "missionary" is a person who is *sent*, from the Latin *missio*: the word "apostle" also means a person who is sent, only it is from the Greek [ἀποστέλλω, *apostello*]. This reminds us at once that the Twelve Apostles were the first Christian missionaries, and that our missionaries to-day are doing the same work as the Apostles did. Indeed we were all once heathen countries, and missionaries came to our ancestors and told them about Christ. Therefore these early missionaries are sometimes called apostles—"S. Patrick, the Apostle of Ireland," for instance. S. Cyril and S. Methodius were the apostles of the Slav races in Eastern Europe; and this reminds us of another interesting thing. The Slavs who were converted by the Eastern Church—Russia, Bulgaria, Serbia—use the alphabet which was brought from the Greek Church by Cyril and Methodius, and is called Cyrillic. But those races who were converted by the various Western Churches (as Scotland was converted by the Irish Celtic Church, Kent by the Roman Church, and West Germany by the Anglo-Saxon Church) use the Roman alphabet. In the one case, Constantinople was the centre of civilisation; in the

other, Rome. It will interest you to see examples of this [*blackboard*]. Here is the word for "England":

Eastern Church.	Greek:	ΑΓΓΛΙΑ
	Russian:	АНГЛІЯ
Western Church.	Late Latin:	ANGLIA.

What does this show us? That these early missionaries *taught our savage ancestors to write.* They not only brought the Christian religion; they also brought civilisation. Every time you read or write you might say "Thank you" to these brave, unselfish missionaries, who made us what we are. We owe them everything.

It is not surprising then, that brave, unselfish men among us to-day should want to do for others what Columba, Augustine, Paulinus, Aidan, and many besides, did for us.

II.—Their Success

As we said two weeks ago [L. 80], it took the missionaries till the 14th century to convert Europe. And even then Russia and Spain were in the hands of the Muslims till the 15th. And in the 15th the Muslim Turks conquered Greece, and S.E. Europe! It was not till the present century—a few years ago—that the Turks were driven back to the last corner of Europe, Constantinople; and there are still many Muslim Turks in Europe now under Christian rule. So Europe was never a Christian continent till the twentieth century. [*Point to Turkey in Europe,* 1900, *on map.*]

For this and other reasons, there was very little missionary work outside Europe till the Reformation Period (16th cent.), when the Jesuits arose and were great missionaries. Our own Church of England had done no mission work, even in heathen Europe, since Anglo-Saxon times. At the Reformation the Protestants were too busy defending themselves at first to think of overseas work. But the desire to spread the Gospel grew. In England the S.P.C.K. was founded in the reign of William III., 1698, and the S.P.G. in 1701; the C.M.S. was founded in George III.'s reign, 1799.

You can get a good idea of the spread of Christianity from those figures we took down the other day [L. 80]:

A.D. 1000. It took 1000 years for the Christian population to reach 50 millions.

1500. It took 500 years more for the Christian population to reach 100 millions.

1700. When our great missionary societies began (*c.* 1700) the C.P. was 155 millions.

1800. After 100 years (1800), 45 million increase, the C.P. was 200 millions.

1900. From 1800, new societies and activities at work: Increase in 100 years (1900) of 300 million, the C.P. was 500 millions.

That is to say:

During the first half of the Christian era the Christian Population reached 50 millions.

During the second half of the Christian era the Christian Population reached 550 millions.

Or:

At first it took 1000 years for an increase of 50 millions.

Nowadays it takes 17½ years for an increase of 50 millions.

Yet many people—I really think most people—have an idea that mission work is rather slow and only moderately successful, and they have a sort of vague idea that in ancient times it was triumphantly rapid!

The rate is *far* more rapid to-day. It is 600 *times as rapid* as during the first half of the Christian era.

III.—The Task

But the world is a very large place. Its population is over 1600 million; so the great majority of people—about 1000 million—are still outside the Christian Church. In the year 1800, 20 per cent. of the world was Christian; in 1900, 35 per cent. [*A diagram of this is published by the S.P.G. on a card which might be shown, or copied on the blackboard.*] The Church has grown rapidly, but she is still young, still undersized!

The principal religions of the world are:

Christianity, 600 million	Hinduism,	217 million
	Buddhism,	200 „
	Confucianism,	300 „
	Islam,	200 „

And besides there are some smaller religions; and also the savage rites of Africa and other places—largely religions of fear. Hinduism includes many strangely different creeds and cults; Buddhism is more a vague philosophy than a religion, and is combined in China with Confucianism, which again is more a code of morals and manners than a religion. Pure Buddhism now only exists in some small countries like Ceylon, Burma, and Tibet. Islam, unlike the others, is a very definite and fiery religion—"There is one God, and Muhammad is his prophet."

Into this vast non-Christian world go the missionaries, the best and wisest class of people in existence. They know more about the problems of the world than other people do, and have nobler ways of solving those problems. They are less uncharitable and quarrelsome, and more tolerant and far-seeing than we are at home. There are all sorts of missionaries: some are preachers, some are doctors, some are nurses, some are professors of history or mathematics, some carpenters and workmen, some parish priests, some deaconesses.

And they succeed as they deserve. Many people think that they often fail—that the Japanese, for instance, borrow our science and refuse our religion. But even in Japan the Roman Church increased by 10,000 in seven years (1913, 66,000; 1920, 76,000), and the other Christian Churches increased from 63,000 in 1910 to 133,000 in 1920.

IV.—Some Reasons

Why do we want to tell these thousand million people about Christ?

1. Because our duty as Christians is to care about other people, to be interested in the whole human race, and to be good friends to all nations and peoples. The love of humanity.

2. Because we owe everything we are most proud of to the Church of Christ. Imperfect and unworthy Christians though we are, we owe our morality, our art and science—our religion and all our civilisation—to the fact that missionaries came to England thirteen centuries ago. We want to do as we have been done by.

3. Because Christianity is the best of all religions. Most of the other religions have much that is good and true in them, for God does not hide himself from those who seek him; but there is also much that is bad and false; and even at their best the other religions are inferior.

4. Because they are inferior, they are disappearing now that scientific education is spread all over the world. Hindus, for instance, who have had a University education, lose their faith in the strange idols and "incarnations" of Hinduism. The old faiths of Asia cannot survive the light of education for many generations. If we do not show them a faith that *can* survive and grow stronger they will have nothing.

5. All the world is one at the present day. Asia and Africa are bound up with ourselves, because of railways, and steamers, and electricity. The wages of coolies in China affect the wages of workmen in England. The nations of Asia are becoming more powerful, as they learn from the Christian nations. If they have not learnt something also of the gentle and charitable gospel of Christ, they will use their power cruelly. Then the miseries and massacres of the past– and they were utterly horrible—will be repeated on a tenfold greater scale.

6. Although ancient nations, like China and India, have a great civilisation of their own, it is in every case inferior to ours—and in the case of pure Muslim nations like Arabia or Afghanistan, a *very* inferior civilisation. The non-Christian nations are in every

case changing their customs for ours, and adopting Christian methods, science and education. It would be the greatest disaster the world has every known if they borrowed the outside of Christianity without the inside, the body without the soul.

Our civilisation has moved so far ahead of the others because it is based on Christian principles. And our enormous power is made juster and more kindly, and of more use to the world by our religion [*e.g. the difference between the Mogul Empire, the Mahrattas, and the British Raj in India*]. We have not been mere destroyers, as the Huns, Arabs and Turks were, but—with all our faults and shortcomings—have brought education, justice, and a higher civilisation in Asia, Africa, and the rest of the world. We want the rest of the world to borrow the religion and the morals of Christendom as well as its science and inventions, its manufactures and its universities.

And we want the non-Christian world to have two things that it has never had before—equal laws for all, and liberty. We call this democracy, and we mean that the whole nation governs itself. It is really Christianity —the belief in the right of every man to just and equal treatment.

7. Now those first six arguments are for men all over the world, whatever their religion. We have not been taking Christianity for granted; we have just given common-sense reasons for everyone, whether he is religious or not. Just from the common-sense, practical point of view, the missionary is the most valuable man in the world.

Of course for *us* there is another reason, the greatest of all. Jesus Christ is the Son of God. He is the only Son—the . . . unique Son of God. That is why Christianity is the unique religion. If all our six first arguments were wrong, we should still believe in oversea missions, simply because we love Jesus Christ.

83

APOSTOLIC, HOLY AND CATHOLIC

[*This Lesson is largely an attempt to summarise what has gone before, looking at the subject from a slightly different angle.*]

THIS is the last Lesson on the Church; and it does seem strange that this subject should take up so much of our time. We only had seven Lessons on the Holy Spirit, and here is the eighth on the much less important subject of the Church. This does seem a want of proportion! And indeed it is. We can't help it, for Christians have quarrelled so badly about the Church to which we all belong, that the subject takes a lot of time. It would be much healthier if all Christians talked more about God and the teaching of Christ—more about their duty to God and to their neighbours, and less about churches and sects, and ministers and ecclesiastical laws. The Church will get to this healthier condition when Christians drop their controversies; and already most sensible men in this country are saying that they are sick of these controversies, and want the Churches to give up finding fault with one another and to devote themselves to God and to righteousness.

So let us try and make ourselves at any rate into healthy Christians, and conclude to-day with trying to take a healthy view of the four Notes of the Church, as they are given in the two Creeds. The Nicene Creed speaks of "one Catholic and Apostolic Church"; so there are three—*one Catholic and Apostolic.* The Apostles' Creed speaks of "the holy Catholic Church": so there is the fourth—*holy.*

I.—One

The Church is one, because she belongs to the one Master, Jesus Christ, and has one faith—the faith in God through Jesus. The outward sign of her unity is the one baptism: people are baptised into the one universal Church of Christ. The Church is the whole company of Christian people. It is nothing less. For any one community to say "I am the one true Church," is as if England should say—or Scotland—"I am the one true British Empire."

But if the Church is the whole company of Christian people, it must be one. There cannot be two whole companies of Christian people.

The miserable divisions in the Church do not alter the fact that it is one. There are divisions in the House of Commons, but it is one House of Commons; there are divisions in the human race, but it is one human race. The sea is divided into many oceans and seas, but it is one sea. Sometimes, as at the Straits of Gibraltar, one sea is almost cut off from another; and you might make a great boom to prevent ships going from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic; you could prevent intercourse, but the sea would still be one.

So the Church is one, but her unity is not yet perfected. She is "like a mighty army," but an army whose generals are not on good terms with one another, and where there are rows between different regiments—both of which things happened during the Great War. In fact her unity is a live and growing thing; it is not static but . . . dynamic: the unity develops, it has grown less and can—and *is*—growing more.

This idea of unity, as something not yet perfectly realised, is certainly the New Testament idea. Our Lord said that all the branches of the vine are one, and the same sap runs through all the branches [*Jn.* 15^{1-5}], but vines grow—they are not static. He prayed for unity, but it was for something to be gradually realised: the words in S. John [17^{23}, R.V.] are "that they may be *perfected into one.*" That is just the idea. So S. Paul does not think of unity as a static thing dependent

upon a particular form of government; he says we are one because we share in the one bread which is the communion of the body of Christ [1 *Co.* 10^{17}]; he says because we have the "unity of the Spirit" we must avoid "schism in the body" [1 *Co.* 12^{13-25}], and try to maintain the "bond of peace" [*Eph.* 4^{4-6}]. Unity is something that can be weakened or strengthened. It grows. It is to be improved and perfected.

This is encouraging: everyone of us can help to increase unity, by being kind to other Christians. It is quite certain that this is what Christ meant when he prayed for unity, and what S. Paul meant—that we should be kind to one another, and avoid quarrelling.

II.—Apostolic

Our Lord then foresaw that the realisation of unity would not come all at once. It has not come yet; but the Church, as we said, has gone through enormous difficulties, and is still at the beginning of her career.

Her difficulties arose especially from the barbarous world in which she lived. Most of her members were half-civilised, and she was always taming new hordes of barbarians. Now barbarians are very pugnacious, and they need a good deal of discipline. Therefore there was much quarrelling: the bishops and patriarchs were violent and uncharitable themselves. The Church split in two: the East separated from the West.

Half-civilised men needed much discipline; and bishops, patriarchs, and popes tried more and more to enforce a very strict order. I don't see what else they could have done. Order was what the world chiefly needed. If a strong pope brought order, can we blame the medieval Papacy? But the time came when order had done its work and made men fit for liberty. The world became more civilised because of all that the Church had done. Men began to demand freedom. But the Church was bound up with an order that had long been despotic: she could not rise to the occasion. The Reformation split the Western Church into fragments.

Division therefore seems to be an inevitable stage in the development of liberty out of order. That is where we are still. Our task now is to combine liberty with order. Great Britain and the British Empire have learnt how to do it. The Catholic Church, alas, has not yet learnt, because the spirit of domination is still too strong.

Well, she will learn in time. She has to be more Apostolic. That is to say, more like the Apostles. We find out what the Apostles thought, in the New Testament. Therefore the more the Church gets back to the New Testament, the more apostolic she will be. We all have to get the *proportion*, as we said, of the N.T.—to put first things *first*, and secondary, less important things second, third, fourth, and fifth. The things that separate the Churches—the papacy, questions of church order, theories about the sacraments, traditions, laws, and customs, however important they are, are not the teaching of the Apostles, and are not in the writings of the Apostles. Therefore we must agree to differ about them for the present, and stick to the Apostles—to the great fundamental truths that the Apostles cared so much about.

Most of all, the Apostles cared for the person and the teaching of Christ. To be Apostolic we must get right back to Christ; and in his religion—so big and simple, so full of liberty and of love, so catholic in the real sense, the Church will one day find again her unity and strength.

III.—Holy

When all the Churches put Christ before everything else, they will still enjoy all the good things that were discovered in the Middle Ages, and since. But they will drop all that is bad, and they will have the mind of Christ. Then they will not quarrel or be separate any more. The Church will realise her holiness.

The mind of Christ can be put in one word—Love. To be holy is to love one another as Christ loved us, to be

friendly and helpful to all other Christians, and also to the great world of a thousand million that is not yet Christian.

As the Church grows a little older and becomes more holy, this friendly spirit will break down all divisions. This spirit of love will succour the poor and oppressed, will secure for all men their daily bread and all their bodily and spiritual necessaries, health and education, freedom and the opportunity to live in virtue and religion. This spirit of love will break down the hatred, prejudice, misunderstanding between nations, and bring an end to war.

Holiness does not mean mere freedom from gross sin. It is not merely negative, it is positive. And the holiness which Christ shows for our example is faithfulness to God, the love of all men, helping all who are in need, spreading charity everywhere.

The Church is holy because she is the Church of Christ. She will realise her holiness as she becomes like Christ, and then she will be the most glorious thing in the world, preaching the Kingdom of Heaven, and bringing it upon earth.

IV.—Catholic

The Church has also to realise her Catholicity. "Catholic" does mean, as we said [L. 76], *universal.* It means also broad-minded, because you cannot be universal unless you *are* broad-minded, as the history of Church divisions proves.

To be really catholic, the Church must be based on liberty, because people will always refuse to be united under a despotism; and while Christians are divided the Church is not really and fully Catholic. This was the case in the past; it will be far more the case in the future, with education spreading every day. That is one reason why the Roman Catholic Church, with all its devotion, loses ground as education spreads.

Liberty existed in the Early Church, at first, because the different local Churches managed their own affairs. The Eastern Churches still keep up this practice. So

do the Anglican Churches. It is called autonomy, but the easiest word to remember is federation (which is really much the same thing), because federation is what keeps the British Empire, and the United States, together. There is a real catholicity in this modern method.

Therefore the Church can realise her catholicity by all the Christian communities—Eastern, Roman, Anglican, Lutheran, &c.—agreeing to make less of their differences, and to respect one another's liberty.

But the Church cannot be completely Catholic while the greater part of the human race remains outside. We shall not know what Christianity can be until we have great Indian Churches, and Chinese and Japanese Churches, and Churches of other races, bringing their special characters and qualities into the whole Church of Christ.

When the whole world is Christian, and every particular Church in the world is apostolic and holy, united in charity with all the rest, then there will be a World Church that will be fully Catholic—One, Apostolic, Holy, and Catholic. But that may well take another two thousand years, though we hope it will be less.

84

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS

1. THE CHURCH MILITANT

[They may be reminded now and then to use initials in taking notes, e.g. "C. of SS."]

I.—Communion

I WONDER how many of you know the meaning of these words—"Communion of Saints." Does anybody? . . . Well, "Communion" does not mean the Lord's Supper here, and "Saints" does not mean very good people. Those are the second meanings. Here the words are used in their original, first meaning.

"Communion" means fellowship. But it means only the very best kind of fellowship. Quite literally, it means *sharing*. If you go out for the day with another boy, you have fellowship with him: but, suppose when you want to buy some food in the middle of the day, you find that you have money in your pocket and he has not, what do you do? You *share*. That is communion, the truest kind of fellowship. Indeed, S. James says [2^{15}] that any other kind of fellowship is what we should now call humbug:—"If a brother or sister be naked, and in lack of daily food . . . what doth it profit?" Therefore he speaks of brotherhood or fellowship as raising the poor and lowering the rich:—"Let the brother of low degree glory in his high estate; and the rich in that he is made low" [1^{9}]. Indeed the first Christian converts at Jerusalem were so keen about this that they sold their property and "had all things common." This we are told twice [*Ac.* 2^{44}, 4^{32}]: nobody said that anything he possessed was his own, but they had all things

in common. This is communism, the most extreme form of communion. In Russia after the Great War, the Bolshevik revolutionaries thought they were anti-Christian; but they could think of nothing more original than to enforce this old Christian idea of communism. They failed, of course, as the early Christians failed; because the world is not nearly good enough for sharing up all property. But all through Christian history tens of thousands of people who were trying to be specially good—the monks and nuns—did practise communism, and still do. Only they were much wiser than the Bolsheviks, because they did it of their own free will. It can't be done by force or by law.

We all do it more or less of our own free will. Every time you put money in the collection you are practising voluntary communism in a small way: you are making an act of communion.

"Communion," then, means fellowship of the most practical kind.

II.—Saints

"Saints" does not mean specially good people here. That was not the original meaning of the word. "Saint" comes from the Latin *sanctus*, which means consecrated, or set apart. Every Christian has been consecrated at his baptism, and set apart from the wicked world [L. 20, 21]. Therefore when S. Paul spoke of saints, he simply meant *Christians*. A Christian ought to be a specially good person, but unfortunately he sometimes isn't. S. Paul told the Cornthians that some of their Christians at Corinth were leading very wicked lives, yet he speaks of them all as "sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints" [1 *Co.* 1^2], and he calls a collection for the Jewish Christians "the collection for the saints" [1 *Co.* 16^1].

So now we have the meaning clear. The C. of SS. = *the Fellowship of Christians*. I wish the words were translated that way in the Creed, because then people would see that they really mean something. Fellowship

is such a noble English word. I once told you before of the saying of the artist-poet, William Morris:—"Fellowship is heaven, and lack of fellowship is hell: fellowship is life, and lack of fellowship is death" [*Dream of John Ball*]. But Communion means even more, it means, as we said, Fellowship in its most practical sense.

III.—Fellowship of all Christians

But there is one more point to remember. The Fellowship of Christians means of *all* Christians. The Christians now living in this world are only *some* Christians. Where are the great majority? . . . In the next world. We must not exaggerate the importance of life in this world, which lasts on the average a good deal less than seventy years.

In our Lessons about the Church I only spoke about the Church in this world. I had not forgotten that by far the larger part of the Church is in the next world, where all its youthful mistakes are corrected; but I did not want to confuse you. So we only spoke of what is called the Church militant—"the Church militant here on earth"—the struggling, battling Church:

> And now we fight the battle,
> But then shall wear the crown
> Of full and everlasting
> And passionless renown.

So sang Bernard of Cluny in the most marvellous of Latin medieval poems [Hora Novissima, *from which* E.*H.* 374, 392, 412, 495 *are all taken.*] The old writers were full of the thought of that greater Church, the Church Triumphant, and wrote many fine poems about it, *e.g.* the great philosopher, Abélard, in the 12th century wrote "O what their joy" [465], and a good Roman Catholic priest in Queen Elizabeth's reign, probably a prisoner in the Tower of London, wrote "Jerusalem, my happy home" [638], 26 verses, which are like a gallery of lovely old pictures. Some of these hymns we will sing.

IV.—Discarnate Christians

So the C. of SS. includes Christians in the next world as well as in this. I am not going to call them "dead Christians," because they are much more alive than we are. It is only their bodies that are dead. So I have given you the accurate and scientific word "discarnate." Incarnate means "in the flesh or body" [*in, caro-carnis*]: the Incarnation means the Logos (or Word of God) coming in the flesh. Discarnate means "away from the flesh," or "outside the body." A discarnate saint is one who is outside his body, who has gone away from his body, because his body is dead. *He* is not dead, but is alive for evermore. There is no such thing as death for human beings. This is very important—the most important thing for us to know. Therefore we will avoid misleading expressions like "dead." We won't say "Poor Tom is dead"; because, "though his body's under hatches, his soul has gone aloft." You remember Dibdin's song, "Tom Bowling" [*they will never forget this part of the Lesson if somebody sings it. It is printed in "Sea Songs," Vol.* II., *Stainer and Bell*]:

> **His form was of the manliest beauty,**
> **His heart was kind and soft,**
> **Faithful below, Tom did his duty,**
> **And now he's gone aloft.**

But I will say more about this part of the subject next time. I only want you to understand now at the outset that "Saints" includes both incarnate and discarnate Christians.

V.—Practical Christianity

This time let us think about the world in which we live. We ought to love all men, Christian or not; but we ought to have a peculiar fellowship with Christians. How ridiculous and how wicked do the quarrels between Roman Catholics and Anglicans and Nonconformists seem, when we say, "I believe in the Fellowship of Christians"! How eager we ought to be to do every possible act of fellowship! [*Possibly T. can point to some act of fellowship in his own parish.*]

How wicked also do our class distinctions and

separations seem! Some people say that they have fellowship with S. Peter, S. Joseph, S. Matthew,—fellowship with dead fishermen, carpenters, and publicans—and would refuse to shake hands with a live fisherman, carpenter or publican. (That shows, by the way, what a silly word "dead" is.) People who love to keep up class-distinctions would, I am afraid, have had little to say to Jesus and his Apostles. Can we have fellowship now with our Lord if we refuse to be friends with his brothers and sisters, the poor people around us—people poorer and sometimes less respectable than we, as well as people richer and grander. The Communion of Saints means that we must be as courteous friendly, considerate, helpful, to the poor as to the rich.

This fellowship of ours must be practical. There is a Russian story which says that once there was a woman who had always lived a very respectable life. When she died and went to hell, she was very much surprised; and she went to S. Peter at the gate of heaven, and said, "Why was I sent to hell? I am a most respectable woman." S. Peter said, "Have you ever done a kind act?" The woman thought for a long time, and then she answered, "Yes: once I gave an onion to a tramp." S. Peter said, "Very well, go back to hell and get the onion; and if you keep tight hold of it all the time it will draw you up to heaven." So she went down and found the onion; and it began to draw her upwards towards heaven. But as she was moving up, a poor sinner caught hold of her dress, hoping to get away from hell also; and then others caught hold of her dress, and clung round her like bees. Then she cried out, "Leave hold of me, you sinners, I am going to heaven!" and she turned and pushed them all back. But she let go of her onion; and back she fell again into hell.

[*As this Lesson lays stress on the earthly aspect of Fellowship, perhaps hymns like E.H.* 464 *and* 423 *are suitable as well as* 428, "*Let saints on earth.*" *For the fellowship with the next world there is the beautiful hymn of Baxter,* 401. *For the blessed dead, Watts' masterpiece,* 199, *also* 197, *and* 486. *For the canonised saints many, especially* 202, 204, 641, *and the less easy* 200.]

85

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS

2. THE CHURCH EXPECTANT

I.—Militant, Expectant, and Triumphant

ALL Christian people have a peculiar and holy fellowship together, which we call the Communion of Saints. If Christianity were merely a dodge for saving your own soul from hell—which has been a very popular view—there would be no Communion of Saints, but there would also be no Christianity. The religion of our Lord is the religion of those who love God as a Father and love one another as brothers.

You can put the religion of Christ in two pictures, each of them a parable of his:—The Good Shepherd, The Good Samaritan; God loving and helping men, Men loving and helping one another.

Last time we spoke of this fellowship, as we ought to practise it on earth—in the Church on earth, the Church . . . Militant.

But, we said, the greater part of the Church is not Militant; it is already in the next world, it is . . . Triumphant. Good people in the next world belong to the Church Triumphant.

But many Christians die who are not very good. If the roof were to fall on us now, and we were all killed, I wonder if we should be good enough to belong to the glorious Church Triumphant in heaven?

Most Protestants used to think that when you died you went straight to heaven or straight to hell, and that the chances were ten to one you went to hell. This was clearly wrong, because it made God cruel, unjust, and weak. (1) It would be most horribly *cruel* for God to send most of his children to endless, indescribable

torment: no human father, even a bad, criminal father, would do anything so cruel. (2) It would be *unjust*; because God's children do not deserve such horrible punishment; especially if, as most of our people used to believe, God himself had arranged beforehand that only a few should be saved from damnation. (This was called Calvinism.) (3) It would be *weak*; because a god who could do nothing with his children—nearly all of them—but send them to hell, would have failed in his work. Of a man who made things that were nearly all failures, and had to be burnt, we should say that he had not made a good job of it. God is almighty, and we may be sure that he can conquer evil. To make a huge swarming hell out of the world would be a hideous failure.

So we are sure that in the next world there are many people who are not yet good enough for heaven, but whom God is teaching, and helping to be better. That gives us another part of the Church—the part that is looking forward to heaven, expecting, hoping—The Church Expectant.

II.—The Invention of Purgatory

In the Middle Ages people had got themselves in a muddle about this very point. If they had really understood that God is love, they would not have got into the difficulty. But the world had been a cruel place, and there was a good deal of half-savage thought even in the Church. Power, as they saw it in their kings and rulers, was very cruel; and they found it almost impossible to think of God being a mighty ruler without being cruel also. Christ's teaching that God rules by love was almost impossible for them to understand. Long ago, S. Augustine (not the one who came to Canterbury, but a much greater man) had laid the foundations of what we call Calvinism; he had taught that the vast majority of mankind are damned through the predestinating will of God, including all little babies who have not been baptised, though theirs was indeed

"the mildest punishment" ["*mitissima poena*"]. He taught, as the Calvinist Protestants taught, that men go either to heaven or to hell, and mostly to hell. All who are not with Christ are with the Devil, he said. ["*Ut possit esse nisi cum diabolo qui non est cum Christo.*"]

This was so horrible that the theologians of the Middle Ages worked out the idea of Purgatory, in order to give some hope for those who were not good enough (or orthodox enough) to go to heaven. They made up an elaborate theory of Purgatory—a place of horrible torture indeed, but still a place where there was hope, because the prisoners were being "purged" of their sins, and would get out after hundreds of thousands of years. You can get a vivid idea of what men thought Purgatory was like towards the end of the Middle Ages, from Dante's great poem on the subject.

Then Luther came, and the Reformation, and he swept away this comparatively merciful idea of Purgatory—cruel mercy as it was—and taught the heaven or hell idea, pure and simple, as Augustine had done. Besides, Purgatory had become associated with the abuses called Indulgences; men could get off thousands of years of Purgatory by saying a short prayer, or simply by giving a little money. The Pope sold indulgences all over Western Europe to raise money for rebuilding S. Peter's at Rome. All this set the Protestants against the idea of Purgatory altogether.

There is, of course, nothing in the teaching of Christ, or of his Apostles, about Purgatory or Indulgences. It was not our Lord's way to describe the next world at all. We could not have understood it if he had. All this elaborate medieval Purgatory was sheer imagination.

But the New Testament does teach us that God loves the world, and that it is his will that all men should be saved, that Christ is the Saviour, and the Good Shepherd who seeks out those who are lost. Therefore we may be sure that God is still helping and saving those discarnate people in the next world who are not good enough for the Church Triumphant.

So we can speak of three parts of the Church. On earth the Church . . . Militant; in heaven the Church . . . Triumphant; and, for those not yet in the glory of heaven, the Church . . . Expectant.

III.—There is no Death

We have communion with the Church Expectant, that is to say, we have fellowship with our Christian brethren in the next world who are not yet in heaven. This does not mean that we can have no fellowship with those discarnate men who were not Christians. As we said last time, we have fellowship with all men in this world, Christian or not; but we have a peculiar fellowship—the Communion of Saints—with our Christian brethren. So in the next world: we have a peculiar fellowship with our fellow Christians in the Church Expectant.

Besides, I would suppose, that non-Christians learn about Christ when they come to the next world. So the distinction between Christians and non-Christians must pass away.

Always remember this—"There is no death." The whole of the Christian religion turns upon this. Indeed, we can have no reasonable philosophy of life at all unless we are sure of this great fact—the immortality of the soul. Life would be a cruel nightmare, if death were the end of it.

There is no death. Our bodies die, but that is nothing. There is not a particle of your body that was there seven years ago; all the body you had when you were a little child is dead long ago. Every time you cut your nails, you are cutting off a piece of dead body, and every time you brush your hair pieces of dead skin fly off. *We* do not die. So you must think of those who are discarnate as just as much alive as when they had mortal bodies; only they are better off, and *more* alive.

Most healthy-minded men feel this, even when they are not supposed to be religious. Here are twelve lines, for instance, from a sonnet by George Meredith to a friend who had died. [*They will understand enough to*

catch the beauty and general meaning, but they will get the meaning better perhaps if the two lines here printed in brackets are omitted.] It is called, "To a Friend Lost":

When I remember, Friend, whom lost I call
Because a man beloved is taken hence,
The tender beauty and the fire of sense
In your good eyes; how full of heart for all,
And chiefly for the weaker by the wall,
You bore your lamps of sane benevolence,
Then see I round you Death his shadows dense
Divide, and at your feet his emblems fall.

For surely are you one with the white host,
Spirits whose memory in our vital air,
[Through the great love of Earth they had; lo, these,
Like beams that throw the path on tossing seas],
Can bid us feel we keep them in the ghost,
Partakers in a strife they joyed to share.

IV.—Telepathy

A friend dying is rather like someone going to a far country. When a friend goes to Australia we see him no more, but he is alive all the same. We can't have the same intimate fellowship, but we can have some fellowship. Before there was a universal post and the telegraph, men often went to a far country, and there was no news of them at all. They could only pray for their friends, and their friends for them. Sometimes they could just get through a scrap of a message. Sometimes, when they died, they were able to show themselves for a moment, at the point of death, to their friends far away. For this strange thing does often happen. It is called telepathy, which means the power of communicating at a distance without using our bodies. So prayer also is a kind of telepathy; we send our thoughts not by letter or telegram, but by the spirit—by something more subtle even than wireless telegraphy.

Here is a small example [*which happened to the writer; T. may have an example of his own*]. A baby was born in India on Jan. 19th [1918]. On the night of the 19th

the grandmother in London dreamt that she had the baby in her arms; next morning (the 20th) she said at breakfast, "Congratulate me, I am a grandmother," and wrote that day to congratulate her daughter in India. The cable message sent on the 20th did not arrive, owing to the War, till the 24th. Telepathy is quite a common thing. It shows that spiritual communication is possible.

V.—Three Ways

Many people who have lost someone they love are quite sure that they feel the presence of the loved one, sometimes very close. Ask your parents about this. Many others have thoughts or messages come to them, sometimes of a very remarkable kind. I do not think there is now any doubt that this Communion of Saints between us and our discarnate friends is an actual fact.

There are three ways in which we can have fellowship with friends in the next world.

1. Spiritual communion with them especially in times of meditation and of prayer. The scientific name for this communion of spirit is telepathy.

2. Praying for them. Christians have always prayed for the departed. But Calvinists did not, and many other Protestants. You see, if you thought God had arranged before hand (predestinated) that your friend should go to hell, it was no use praying for him when he was "dead." But I can't really see what was the use of praying for him when he was alive either, if his fate was all settled beforehand.

So we follow the Catholic custom of praying for the welfare of the departed—not merely for their rest, but for their whole life and the education of their spirits to higher and higher light.

3. They pray for us. The prayer is on both sides: it is a real communion. They can help us; for instance, I feel sure that a mother in the next world watches over her child. In Russia, if a boy loses his mother, he will often

stand before her photograph and talk to her and ask her to help him; and I feel sure he is right. Some of the early Christian tombs [*3rd century*] have a sentence cut on them asking for the prayers of the person whose body has been laid within. I remember a beautiful one on the tomb of a little child—"Pray for thy parents."

86

THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS

3. THE CHURCH TRIUMPHANT

I.—The Saints in Heaven

WE have said that the Communion of Saints means that all Christians in this world and the next are united in a great brotherhood together; that, therefore, we ought (1) to be friendly and helpful to one another in this life, that is, in the Church Militant; (2) to pray for those in the next world, and as far as possible to have loving communication with them, feeling sure that they pray for us. We spoke last time of those in the Church . . . Expectant. To-day we will think of those in the Church . . . Triumphant.

What is the Church Triumphant? It consists of the saints who have been purified from all sin, who have been educated to that high plane where they can see God. You remember we once said there were many heavens [L. 66]: S. Paul speaks of being caught up even to the third heaven [2 Cor. 12^2], the Jews believed there were seven heavens; and, in the New Testament, heaven is constantly called "the heavens." So the Saints in the Church Triumphant are those who have been raised into the higher heavens—the higher planes of existence in the next world. We generally use a capital letter for these glorified Saints.

II.—Canonised Saints

Some of these Saints are canonised; that is, one of the ancient Churches has officially declared them to be Saints,

and has put them in its list of Saints and in the Kalendar. There are such lists in the Eastern Churches, and in the Western Churches, none of them quite the same—the Kalendar of the Church of England, for instance, even before the Reformation, had some local English Saints which were not in the Kalendar of the Church of Rome; and since the Reformation the Kalendar in the Prayer Book has been a much shorter one.

But most of the Saints in glory are not in any Kalendar. They are all commemorated together on one day. Which? . . . All Saints. You see, men can never tell who are the greatest Saints: only God can tell. So some of the most famous have their special days in the Kalendar, like S. . . .'s Day: the majority, only God and the heavenly spirits know the names of.

On the other hand, oddly enough, some people got into the Kalendar who were not particularly good people, but just happened to be well-known Christians of their day; and at the same time much greater men never got in. For instance, the greatest and best of English kings—who was he? . . . Alfred never got into the Kalendar, while several other Anglo-Saxon kings and queens did, one of whom was only a boy of seventeen. This was S. Edward, King of the West Saxons (March 18th). The Queen, his step-mother, wanted her own son, Ethelred, to be king; one day Edward came into Corfe Castle, tired and thirsty from hunting, and there was his wicked step-mother waiting for him: she called a servant man to come with a knife, she went up to the boy king, and gave him a cup of ale, as he sat on his horse; and, as he drank, the servant killed him. So the Queen's own son, Ethelred, became king, and he was such a stupid king that the people called him the Unready, but Edward they made into a Saint.

So the Kalendars don't give us altogether a list of the best men, but only of some of the best men. There are great Saints, like King Alfred, who were never canonised; and there are "ten thousand times ten thousand" whose names are utterly forgotten [*Rev.* 7^{9}; *hymn E.H.* 486].

III.—Invocation and Worship

Some of the Saints, then, are in the Kalendar; and they are mentioned in the prayers and hymns on the various Saints' Days. But this is the commemoration of the Saints, and not Communion with them. Communion means more than commemoration, and involves some sort of message-sending, some sort of prayer. The whole Church has always believed that the Saints pray for us. That is some sort of communion or fellowship.

But there is a step further. Christians seem always to have *asked* the Saints to pray for them, at least there are inscriptions as early as the 3rd century. You remember last time I mentioned a touching inscription on a child's tomb . . .? "Pray for thy parents." There are many others of the 3rd century: here is one, "*Vivas in pace et pete pro nobis*," which in English is, "Live in peace and pray for us." (I like that: "Live in peace" is better than "Rest in peace.") Telepathy, you remember, means sending a message direct from spirit to spirit; and I suppose a message or a wish of that sort would reach the departed person by telepathy. Asking the Saints to pray for us is called the Invocation of Saints.

The early Christians naturally admired and loved the martyrs very much. So it became usual to ask the martyrs especially to pray for those on the earth; and people used to flock to their tombs in the catacombs, and ask for their prayers, and take away little bottles of oil from the lamps which burnt before their tombs, and use this oil for healing the sick.

So the worship of the Saints grew up. We have to discuss this because there has been, and is, a great deal of controversy about it.

If you asked me whether I thought it was wrong to worship the Saints, I could not say Yes. There is a way in which it is right to worship people. I expect you all worship somebody or other—your mothers and other people; though of course this is not the same way as the way we ought to worship God.

Well, the great Christian principle, we said, is—There is no death. If you worship a good person in this life, you go on worshipping him when he is discarnate; because only his body is dead. In the same way, of course, if it is right to ask a friend to pray for you in this life, it is equally right to ask one to pray for you who is in the next life. In the same way, if it is right to ask a friend to help you, in this life, it cannot be wrong to ask a Saint. It may be a mistake, but it cannot be wrong.

IV.—Exaggeration

But, if you go into a church, say, in France, you will see large gaudy statues, with people kneeling before them, and apparently praying to them. The Saints seem almost to have taken the place of God sometimes; and it is rather a strange collection of Saints—not those who are prominent in the New Testament, but Our Lady of the Immaculate Conception, S. Joseph, and S. Anthony of Padua, are the popular and prominent ones. And then there is a statue of our Lord with his heart showing. All this does seem to make a queer religion, and to have little in common with the religion of Christ. Protestants are shocked by it all, and say, "What idolatry!" But when you go into it, there is a good deal to be said on the other side; or, at all events, you can understand how it all came about; and you can put most of it down to want of education. It has grown up in the course of many centuries, and is a help to many poor and simple people. Protestants made a mistake in abusing this exaggerated Saint worship. We should never abuse the religious practices of other Christians. But we can give our reason for not following these practises. And our reason is that we want to get religion into the right proportion; we want to avoid fanciful and exaggerated forms of worship. We want to be as like Christ as we can, and we are only told of him and his Disciples that they worshipped God, and prayed to God. So that praying to the Saints can easily be exaggerated to throw the religion of Christ out of all proportion, and it *was*

exaggerated throughout the Middle Ages. At the Reformation, Protestants threw it all up, and our tendency is rather to minimise than to exaggerate the Communion of Saints. They abolished both saint-worship and image-worship.

V.—Image-Worship

It is possible to worship Saints without worshipping images. But in practice they generally go together.

There was once a great controversy about image-worship [*The Iconoclastic Controversy*, 726–842], and it must be admitted that the image-breakers behaved with barbarous ferocity (as did the Reformers, Puritans, and French Revolutionaries in more modern times). In the end the Eastern Churches decided to forbid statues, and only to allow flat pictures. We shall say more about this next year when we come to the Decalogue. But really in the Eastern Church to-day, people bow down before their flat pictures [*ikons*] at least as much as Roman Catholics do before statues or pictures. And they use even more flowery and elaborate expressions to S. Mary and the other Saints.

Yet we find it easy to be friends with the Eastern Churches. And the reason is that they are friendly to us, and do not attack us: so we find it easier to make allowances for the greatly different customs which they have inherited.

I said just now that to worship the Saints, and to ask their prayers and help cannot be wrong (in principle), but may be mistaken. What did I mean?

1. It is very easily exaggerated, and turned into a sort of idolatry.

2. It easily becomes fanciful. Saints have often been worshipped of whom hardly anything is known; and legends are made up about them. S. Joseph is an example: he is now vastly popular in the Roman Church, but we know hardly anything about him. The worship of S. Mary takes an enormous place both there and in the Eastern Churches; but in the Gospels she is not at all prominent.

3. It is badly mixed up with things legendary and untrue, which have come down from times of great ignorance compared with our own; and there is an ugly trail of falsehood over the whole practice.

4. Though it is natural to suppose that our own friends in the next world can receive messages from us, it is difficult to imagine that the prominent Saints spend their existence listening to millions of petitions. Christ told us nothing about such a thing. Perhaps these petitions are all wasted. It is said that they reach God anyhow, and that the Saints know of them because they see God. But this is mere speculation.

5. The time spent in praying to saints would be better spent in praying to God. In practice, an enormous amount of prayer is diverted from God and given to our Lady and the other Saints.

Such are some of the reasons against that exaggeration of the Communion of Saints, which is partly due to our pagan ancestry. Probably it was a great gain to the strength and truthfulness of the British people that the whole practice was cut away at the Reformation. We know, from the Gospels, that at least our Prayer Book cannot be wrong in not addressing prayers to the Saints. We know that the Apostles did not kneel before images.

But we must not minimise. "Brethren pray for us," said S. Paul to his disciples; and it cannot be either unreasonable or wrong for us to say, "Brethren pray for us" to the Saints in heaven, and to sing their praises and to hail them in loving fellowship, especially on the days which are set apart for their honour. It is all a matter of proportion—this, like everything else.

87

THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS

I.—A New Thing

FORGIVENESS is one of the most important things in the Christian religion: indeed it has been called "Christ's most striking innovation." When we say of a man, "He shows a very Christian spirit," we always mean that he is very forgiving. And this is quite true, because the pagan world before Christ did not think that forgiveness was a duty: "The pagan ideal of manly life was to succeed in doing as much good to your friends and as much injury to your enemies as possible." So our Lord reminded his hearers that those of old time said, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy" [*Mt.* 5^{43}]. And the reason he gave for this was that forgiveness is God's way, and we have to be like God, "sons of your Father which is in heaven." People had thought that God exacted vengeance for sin and punished men—"Vengeance is mine: I will repay, saith the Lord," S. Paul quoted [*Ro.* 12^{19}], urging his readers not to take vengeance themselves, "Vengeance belongeth unto me." But Christ had gone farther even than that: he said, God is perfect, and though he has the power of vengeance, he does not use it: "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust." He is perfect [*Mt.* $5^{45, 48}$], and there can be no strain of vengeance, anger or cruelty in the divine nature.

So the Christian Gospel is a new gospel of forgiveness. God does forgive and man must forgive. We shall come to this again when we talk about the Lord's Prayer [L.133]. There are three Greek words in the N.T. for forgiveness

[καλύπτω, *e.g. in Ro.* 4^7, *"to cover"*; χαρίζεσθαι, *e.g.* 2 *Co.* 2^7, *"to be gracious to"*; and ἀφίημι, *e.g. Mt.* 6^{12}, *"to let go,"* ἄφεσις, *remission*]. The word used over and over again by Christ [*it is scarcely found except in the Gospels and Acts*] means *to let go*, to remit completely, as when a creditor lets off his debtor. Forgiveness [ἄφεσις] in the mouth of Christ means that the sin is done away; the whole cause of offence is removed: it is washed out: the sinner has no longer the sense of sin or any liability to punishment.

II.—Complete Forgiveness

Of course such a new gospel as this has been very difficult to learn. After the Great War, the whole of Europe nearly broke up into destruction, because the nations *would* not forgive one another; they would not forgive each other's sins, and they would not forgive each other's debts.

In the same way people still often say that God does not really and completely *forgive*; they want one of the weaker words; they can't bring themselves to believe in Christ's strong word, which means that sin is completely washed out. They often say, God may forgive a bad man, but he is still a bad man. Sometimes they say with Queen Elizabeth, "God may forgive you, but I never can!" They forget that to be forgiven by God is to become innocent again; and you *must* forgive an innocent person. They often think that disreputable sins can't be really forgiven, and that they can hardly touch a disreputable person however much he has repented—especially if it be a disreputable woman. [*This Victorian code is well illustrated by the treatment of Little Em'ly in "David Copperfield."*] Again, other people say that God removes the guilt of sin, but does not remove its punishment. This is not true either. You cannot justly punish an innocent man, and God makes us innocent again when he forgives us. Besides, God does not punish, he is equally good to the just and to the unjust. It is we who punish ourselves. If you drink

poison, you die: God does not kill you; you kill yourself. If you drink too much alcohol, you get ill; and if you go on, you die of some disease before your time is up. You make your own punishment: God does not give the drunkard a diseased liver, the drunkard does that himself. Sin does indeed bring what we call punishment, but often it brings punishment to the innocent as well as to the guilty—to the drunkard's wife and children, for instance; and this alone shows that God does not inflict it, but the sinner brings it himself. If the sinner repents, he is forgiven; but it is often too late to undo the harm that has been done. The drunkard's health will certainly improve if he repents, but it will follow the laws of the body, and he may have injured himself so much that he will never be really well again.

Let us then get away from the ideas of vengeance and punishment, which have come down to us from our barbarian forefathers, and let us try to believe the teaching of Christ. God completely washes away sin. God eternally sheds forgiveness on mankind. The man who is forgiven is completely restored to his former condition.

There is no limit to God's forgiveness. So entirely did our Lord believe this, that he cried out upon the Cross, "Father forgive them; for they know not what they do."

III.—The Cross

The Cross is the symbol of God's forgiveness. It does not show God punishing men, but men punishing God. He let men hurt him, and his voice was still the voice of love and mercy. When people say that God could not pardon men until his vengeance had been appeased by the death of his Son, they make God as evil as themselves; and they talk as if there were two gods one making a bargain with the other [*as in the "Paradise Lost" of Milton who was an Arian—and in much less unorthodox theology.*] All these ideas of forgiveness being wrung out of God by some blood-sacrifice, all these ideas of the Atonement being extorted by some

payment, or bargains, or trick, belong to men's barbarous imaginations, and are opposed to the teaching of Christ.

God did not need to be propitiated. It is perhaps unfortunate that we use the word—as in the text quoted in the Communion Service, "He is the propitiation for our sins,"—because it is not an easy word to understand. Libraries of books have been written about it and we can only say in the end that the writers of the Epistles (especially S. Paul), being Jews, used Jewish metaphors and arguments which we generally misunderstand. So I will just repeat—God did not need to be propitiated. If you want a little more, here are two summaries by great scholars:—"Such phrases as 'propitiating God' and God 'being reconciled,' are foreign to the language of the New Testament. *Man* is reconciled (2 *Co.* 5^{18}; *Ro.* 5^{10})." [*Dr. Westcott.*] "Propitiation [means] breaking down the barrier which sin interposes between God and man." [*Dr. Driver.*]

Forgiveness, then, is the very nature of God. That is why "our heavenly Father is perfect," and why we have to forgive others and to love our enemies, in order that we may become perfect like our Father in heaven [*Mt.* 5^{48}]. The Cross shows us that the long-suffering of God is infinite, and that his forgiveness is full and free.

IV.—The Power of Forgiveness

That has always been the power of the Cross. Throughout Christian history men have looked up at the Cross and their hearts have been melted by what they have seen there. They have seen a God of gentleness and love—not a God so angry with sin that he could only be satisfied by a bloody sacrifice—but a God so patient and so full of love that he let men hurt him and kill him in his incarnate form so that he might win them from their selfishness and cruelty and sin, and might make atonement with them. Those are the right words which are written in Latin over the great crucifix in S. Paul's Cathedral. *Sic Deus dilexit mundum*, "So God loved the world" [*Jn.* 3^{16}].

The Cross shows God's forgiveness because it shows his love. That was God's method: it was the method which showed most love, and therefore called forth most love in man.

We have discovered in modern times that Christ's new way of forgiveness showed his profound knowledge of human nature. What we call modern psychology proves how completely he discovered the truth; if you show love, you call forth love from others; if you freely forgive others you make them good—you convert them.

There was once a drunken soldier, an old offender, who had been reprimanded, put in the cells, flogged, over and over again. At last one day he was brought before the commanding officer by a very wise old sergeant. "Here he is again!" said the Colonel, "And we have tried everything that the regulations allow." "Beg pardon, sir," said the old sergeant, "but, if I might make so bold, there's one thing that ain't never been done to him yet, sir." "What's that?" said the Colonel. "Well, sir, nobody ain't ever tried forgiving of him, sir." "*What*?!!" said the Colonel, in a fury; for he was a quick old gentleman: but he thought a bit, and said, "Bring the man up," "Well," he said to the old offender, "What have you got to say for yourself?" but there was a kindness in his eye as he said it. "Nothing, sir," said the man, "only, only, I'm sorry for having done it." "Very well," said the Colonel, more kindly than ever, "Now we're going to—forgive you." "For-give!" murmured the man, and the tears came into his eyes. He could say nothing more till he fairly burst out crying, and then said, "Thank you, sir. You won't have no trouble over me again." And from that day there was no straighter man in the regiment.

88

FORGIVENESS AND REPENTANCE

I.—Not Retribution

WE spoke last time of this new idea that our Lord brought into the world, of God's complete forgiveness; of this splendid new truth, which modern psychology has shown to be far truer than men knew before, because to forgive a man completely is to bring out the best that there is in him. We said that even Christian men have been dazzled and confused by the good news, and have found it very hard to accept, with all that it involves. Men had always associated sin with vengeance and with punishment, and their ideas of punishment were very cruel—often unspeakably cruel. They did not see that punishment is only a necessary evil, and that (in a school, for instance) we have as little of it as possible—far less than our grandfathers had—and only have it at all because you can't keep order without some punishment, though you try and make punishment as mild as possible. In Dotheboys Hall Mr. Squeers was always flogging the boys: in a great school to-day most of the order is kept without punishment at all; boys wouldn't dream to-day of doing the things which were done a hundred years ago; most of the order is due to the respect that the boys have for honour and traditions of the school. Cruelty is not necessary, even force is hardly used at all.

We have learnt all that from Christ. But the world has been slow in learning it. In prisons they say that they keep in view three objects—Retribution (paying the criminal out), Deterrence (to deter, or discourage people from committing crimes, Reformation (to make the criminals into better people). The first of these, Retribution, will be dropped altogether,

probably before very long: it is mainly due to a bad theology, which comes down from barbarous ages. We don't want to pay the criminal out. We want to reform him. So the most modern improved prisons put Reformation first, Deterrence second, and instead of Retribution they would put, I suppose, Safety—the protection of society. We have to lock burglars up, or they would go on burgling; but we don't hate them, or want to hurt them: we want to find out the very best ways of making them better. We forgive them. In the old days prisons were horrible places, and made the prisoners far worse than before. Then John Howard and Elizabeth Fry went among the prisoners, helping them and doing them good. That was true forgiveness: those great saints like Elizabeth Fry, really loved the poor prisoners; and prison-reform began. It is not finished yet, but the law is far less cruel than it was in the eighteenth century, when even women and boys were hanged for petty acts of theft, and the prisons were sinks of iniquity and hot-beds of fever. (In 1815 over 160 crimes were punishable by death; a man could be hanged for stealing five-shillings worth of goods from a shop: but the juries already were more merciful than the law, and generally declared the petty criminal "not guilty.") Now as punishment has become less, criminals have become fewer. We are giving up the idea of retribution, and make punishment into a means of reformation instead. And there is less crime and drunkenness in the world than ever there was before.

So we can understand why there is no retribution with God. He could strike sinners dead, if he chose; but that would not make them better. He suffers them to go on, and he makes them better in his own way—by forgiving them, which is the only way.

II.—Free Forgiveness

The good news has always seemed too good. Men have always tried to put limits round God's forgiveness, ever since our Lord taught that it had no limits. God

could not have forgiven, they said, without a sacrifice. He could only forgive, they said, through baptism; and many good men taught that sins committed after baptism could not be forgiven (and therefore Constantine the Great, and many others, put off baptism till they were dying, so as to get all their sins washed out at the end of their lives—again the idea of a trick). Others said that men could not be forgiven outside the Church, which generally meant their own church; or unless a man went to Holy Communion. And generally that forgiveness had to be got through Absolution, after confession to a priest. And yet even with all this, they believed, in the Middle Ages (and multitudes still believe), that when a man is dying and has received absolution through a priest, and has received the Communion, he still needs another form of forgiveness called Holy Unction. And when the Reformers gave that up, they put up other barriers, and said that a man needed a special kind of faith before he could be forgiven; while others said he could never be forgiven at all unless God had predestinated it in his special case before the beginning of the world.

So many barriers! No wonder poor Christians have been confused by all the elaborate ideas that so many clergymen have taught! No wonder the lovely, simple teaching of Jesus has been obscured! The world was not good enough for it. [L. 133].

But, does this mean that whatever you do, it does not matter, because God always forgives? Not at all!

III.—Getting Forgiveness

It is quite simple. God forgives; but you have to *receive* his forgiveness.

Think of a fountain. The clean water is always pouring out, but if you prefer to spend your time in a pig-stye, you won't get clean. You must go to the fountain to get washed.

Think of the sunshine. That also is a great cleanser. People are now getting healed of diseases by the sunlight

cure. But if you live in a London fog, or at the bottom of a coal-mine, you won't have the sunlight cure,—nor even in a sunny place, if you wear dark clothes, and a hat, and carry a sunshade. People who go in for this cure, live in some sunny place, and take off their clothes and bask in the sun.

It is all so simple that I know you understand completely. Open the shutters, and the geranium on your window-sill will live; close the shutters for long enough, and the geranium will die. The forgiveness of God is like the sunlight on the earth. The earth turns round to receive the sunlight; if it did not turn, one side of the earth would die.

One of the finest hymns in English is by the poet Cowper, and it begins with the verse:

> There is a fountain filled with Blood,
> Drawn from Emmanuel's veins,
> And sinners plunged beneath that flood
> Lose all their guilty stains.

At first that old-fashioned phraseology about blood sounds ugly to our ears; but if we take it as a poetic metaphor, we see how true a description it may be. Cowper (I hope) meant by "blood" the very life and love of Christ—the divine power of forgiveness.

IV.—Repentance

We have then to turn ourselves round, like the earth, to receive the sunshine; or, if you prefer the metaphor [*it is important for them to get used to this word*], to open the shutters; or to get up and wash in the fountain of love. This act is called . . . Repentance.

Repentance is often analysed into three parts, Contrition, Confession, and Amendment. This is really a matter of common sense, as you will all see, if we mention the three parts one by one:

1. *Contrition* means being sorry that you have done wrong, and desiring to be better. Any child knows that he cannot be forgiven unless he is sorry. If a child stole sixpence, and was quite happy about it—rather proud of it than otherwise—and was hoping to get a

chance of stealing some more, well! that would not be a case for forgiveness! We have to be sorry for our sins.

But this does not mean that we cannot be forgiven by God unless we are very miserable. Some people don't find it easy to be miserable. But we can all be sorry, and rather ashamed, when we have done wrong. We know we have sinned, we don't try to hide it from God, we acknowledge it. That brings us to our second part, Confession.

2. *Confession* means simply acknowledging to God that you have done wrong. "I acknowledge my transgressions; and my sin is ever before me," says the greatest of the Penitential Psalms, Ps. 51, which is called the *Miserere*. Confession does *not* mean trying to make a list of every wrong thing you have ever done, and then reading it out; nor does it mean describing some sin in all its nasty detail. This is silly and mechanical; and Confession is a straightforward manly thing. I am sure that God does not want lists of our sins: he wants us to acknowledge our sins, to confess that we have done wrong and are sorry for it So remember that fussing about little sins is very common, but it is not Christian. Our Lord said very little about sin (and the distinctions of the Middle Ages between mortal and venial sin have no sanction in his teaching, though they had their use once); but he said a great deal about forgiveness. On the other hand, remember the danger of not confessing sin. There are many people who do the most horrid things, and are quite complacent about them, and never show any sign of confession. We must acknowledge our sins to God; though we do it briefly, we must do it earnestly.

There are two other kinds of confession:

a. General Confession. This is when all the people say a confession together in church, and the priest pronounces the absolution or forgiveness of sins. He does this as the minister of God, speaking in God's name; and as the representative of the Church, using that power of forgiveness which belongs to the whole society of Christian people. We wrong the Church

when we sin; we disgrace the Church, and hurt her, and we make it harder for other people to be better. So, after the General Confession, the Church forgives us, and her representative pronounces God's forgiveness.

b. Auricular Confession, which means confession into the ear of a priest. Once, in early days, people used to do penance (sometimes in a white sheet, holding a candle) before everybody in church, and this public penance continued long after the Reformation. But long ago, far back in the Middle Ages, it was felt to be too difficult and bitter for people to confess their sins as the usual thing in public: so, to make it easier, they were only required to confess their sins privately before a priest. This worked well for a long while, when people were still more simple and childlike than they are now; but it has not worked so well in modern times, and compulsory confession is a considerable difficulty in those Churches where it is still the rule. The men revolt against it by thousands. The Roman Church retains the rule; some of the Eastern Churches have dropped it; and the Church of England dropped it at the Reformation.

But the Prayer Book teaches [*the Communion, First Exhortation*] that those who have any sin upon their conscience, if they cannot quiet their conscience, should tell it in confession to a priest and receive the assurance of God's forgiveness in Absolution. This is surely very wise; and it is very important for everyone to remember. Regular confession before a priest is not authorised in the Anglican Churches, though it is not forbidden; and such confession cannot be compulsory with us. But most people get into trouble of mind over their sins sooner or later; and it is important for all to remember that we must never despair, or lose hope; because we are always invited to open our grief to a priest and to receive the blessing of absolution and a quiet conscience.

3. *Amendment*, the third part of Repentance, is quite simple, and is also a matter of common sense. You cannot repent without wanting to be better. Furthermore, if we have harmed anyone, we have also to try

and make restitution. A man who has stolen something, for instance, must give it back, if he can, and also try to be honest in the future. Whenever we repent, we do want to be better in the future; otherwise our repentance would be a mockery. We do know indeed that we shall not be sinless in the future, but we want to overcome our sin, and to grow into better and better people. We want to amend our lives, and to improve.

V.—Forgiving Others

Our Lord tells us that we shall have the forgiveness of God if we repent; but he also tells us that we can't expect to be forgiven unless we forgive others. Our repentance will not be a true repentance unless we go on forgiving others over and over and over again. This is so important that we are putting it down as our last point, though we shall speak of it again when we come to the Lord's Prayer—as of course you understand. To-day I will only tell you a true story about a soldier in the Crimean War. His name was Captain Horace de Vere. He was badly wounded, but after the war he recovered from his wounds, was happily married and had two little girls. The soldiers at that time were much given to drunkenness, and Captain de Vere, in order to encourage them to be better, gave extra pay to all who were sober for a week. One man, whom the Captain had had to pass over because he was not sober, was so angry that he shot him. Horace de Vere lingered for a fortnight. The trooper's vindictiveness, his vengeance, continued: although he knew he would be executed if his Captain died, he went on saying that he hoped he would die. But the Captain sent for him on his deathbed, and devoted all his remaining strength to softening the trooper's hate-blinded heart. He had always forgiven the trooper, and at last he made the trooper forgive him. Then Horace de Vere died, but he had won the soul of his murderer.

89

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY

I.—Not Resuscitation

THE Creed ends, like a piece of music, in a crescendo of hope and freedom: the fellowship of saints, the getting free from sin, the conquest of death and eternal life. "I believe in the Resurrection of the body" is our subject to-day; and I think it means the conquest of death, the conquest even of the death of the body.

But I am afraid we must admit that the Christians of old time meant something very crude and material by the Resurrection of the body. You can see it in countless old pictures and pieces of sculpture. They thought there would be very soon a great last day, a day of twenty-four hours, a Day of Judgement, when Christ would come, with angels, sitting upon a cloud; there would be thunder and lightnings and earthquakes, and all the tombs and graves would fly open, and the dead bodies would crawl out of the graves, and their flesh would come alive again; and all the people who had been drowned would rise out of the sea. They did not apparently worry about those who had been burnt. Indeed, only a few years ago many good people opposed cremation, because they said that, if people's bodies were burnt, there would be nothing to rise again! And I remember the answer that was always made to them was—can you guess? . . . How about all the martyrs who were burnt?

This idea is not really resurrection at all, but *re-suscitation*. So let us use that word for it, and avoid confusion.

II.—Primitive Ideas

We have often been noticing lately how savage ideas crept back into the minds of Christian people, and how long these old primitive human notions have survived. In recent years the study of savage men's minds has become an important science, and we can understand many things that were hidden to our forefathers. [*T. must be cautious in quoting from books that are a few years old, for anthropology is developing rapidly: some of Frazer's most important theories are now out of date (see, e.g. Beibitz, "Belief, Faith and Proof,") and a new system has been propounded by Rivers, Perry, and Elliot Smith. See e.g. the article in the new Supplement of the "Encyclopædia Britannica."*] Savage and primitive men were simple-minded and childlike, they were very much afraid of the unseen world, they were cruel, and they had a materialistic way of looking at things. (1) Because they were simple-minded, they thought of their gods as walking about like human beings. (2) Because they were superstitious and cruel they tried to propitiate their gods with bloody sacrifices—sometimes with human sacrifices. In the story of Abraham and Isaac [*Gen.* 22] we see the ancient Jews discovering that human sacrifices were not required by Jehovah. (3) And because they were materialistic, they thought of the future life as a material one. Everybody knows (and has seen in museums) how the Egyptians used to preserve their dead as mummies so that they might rise again, and used to bury with them all sorts of useful things—even bread—so that might find them ready when they woke up. But more interesting things have been discovered lately: we now know, by the weapons and utensils discovered in their tombs, that even the oldest stone men—thousands and thousands, and tens of thousands of years ago—believed that they were immortal, and buried things with the dead bodies of men, which they were supposed to use in a future life.

It is enormously interesting and encouraging to discover that even primitive man did not think that

death was the end of everything, that even to his dark mind God had been able to reveal some measure of the blessed hope of everlasting life. But his mind *was* dark; and he could only think of immortality in a materialistic way. It is no wonder that this materialism persisted for a long time, in spite of Christianity. We all have a savage hidden away in us, and it comes out when men fight; they are not really going mad—they are only becoming savages again, with the old primitive blood-lust upon them. And every time you lose your temper, you become a bit of a savage! The old man pops up! That is why S. Paul tells us [*Col.* 3^9, *cf. Eph.* 4^{22}, *Ro.* 6^6] to put off the old man.

III.—S. Paul and the Resurrection

Well, this primitive idea of resurrection kept coming back into the minds of Christians. The more civilised inherited savage ideas from the pagan world of the Roman Empire; the less civilised were converted barbarians, or their descendants. This materialistic idea—of people climbing out of their graves and their bodies coming to life again—*resuscitation*, is as a matter of fact, the exact opposite to the teaching of S. Paul.

We can put S. Paul's teaching in one sentence. S. Paul taught that there are two kinds of body, a natural and a spiritual (more literally, a soul-body and a spirit-body). [1 *Co.* 15^{35-58} R.V.] In this life we have a natural body, in the next life, in our resurrection, we shall have a far finer body, a spiritual body. To help his hearers to understand, he gave the analogy or illustration of a grain of corn: the corn is one kind of body, and the plant that grows up has quite a different body, with stem and leaves and flowers. But then people misunderstood and pressed the analogy too far. They said: "O yes, just as the corn is put in the ground and comes up again, so dead men are put in the ground and come up again." They forgot that this is not at all the same thing, because the body of a man is dead when it is put in the ground, but the grain of corn is *alive.*

S. Paul had used the illustration to show how completely different is the risen spiritual body from the mortal natural body; but this was just the point which our forefathers often missed.

Where had S. Paul learnt his doctrine? He had learnt it, of course, from . . . yes, from the Resurrection of Christ. That was not a resuscitation. Our Lord did come to life again and walk out of the tomb. He was completely changed: his natural body became a spiritual body. It was quite different; he could appear and vanish as he wished. That is what Resurrection means.

IV.—Popular Notions

We have had to say a good deal about the mistaken idea of resuscitation, because it is still very common. I am sorry to say, it occurs in several hymns, but we do not use them—or, if we do, we leave out the verses about resting in the grave, or the rending of the tomb, as in that fine hymn [verses 7 and 8] "Through the night of doubt and sorrow," which was written by a Dane about a century ago. At that time people generally talked of the departed as if they were lying under the ground in the churchyard. What a horrible idea! Yet people still do talk like that. They used to think that sometimes men's spirits or ghosts got out of their graves and walked about. How awful, and how silly! No wonder the word ghost fell into disrepute! Even to-day people still often struggle between two ideas: they think the departed are beautiful spirits about us, and yet at the same time they think of them as gruesome corpses lying in graves. These two ideas are contradictory, and the first is the true one. When a person dies, his body dies, not his spirit; and his body is left behind like a chrysalis. It is of no importance whatever, and it doesn't really matter what happens to it. The best thing is to burn it. We ought not to block up churchyards or churches with ugly tombs and monuments. Most of our beautiful old buildings are being ruined by them; and cemeteries, too, are hideous places.

Our forefathers (in spite of their mistaken ideas about resurrecton) were in practice far better than we. They generally put up little wooden memorials that soon perished; and in the midst of the churchyard there was just one tall and beautiful cross, as a symbol of hope for everybody.

The natural body, then, when it is worn out and dead, is of no importance. It soon passes back into the elements from which it was made.

V.—What is a Body?

There are then two kinds of bodies; and the resurrection means having the better kind, the . . . spiritual body.

Now what is a body? It is an outward and visible sign of something invisible. It is something which is able to *express* things and to *do* things. Put a little less simply, a body is that which is able to manifest thoughts and feeling, and able also to operate on its environment —that is, to touch and move things near it. For instance, a dog's body can manifest his affection for you, and it can also operate on a bone. A body is a vehicle of manifestation and of action. Your body is the expression of your personality.

Now, how did your body come into existence? *You collected it.* That sounds strange, but it is perfectly true, *You,* that is the soul within you, has been collecting particles of matter and building them up into a body, ever since you began to exist, months before you were born. Your soul is always busy collecting matter from the earth; your spirit—the thinking part of you—does a good deal too, for instance, when you eat a meal; but your soul takes that food and builds it up into the very complex, beautiful, and constantly changing structure which is called your body, and your soul is always at work—with every breath and heart-beat, even when your spirit is asleep. *You,* then, collect and build up particles of matter to form this expression of yourself—your body. The particles are always being changed:

as we said before [L. 85] your whole body is changed about every seven years. *Yet your body is the same.* The expression of your face, your general shape, even *scars*, persist; there is something spiritual about your body which goes on. The personal identity goes on.

The resurrection of the body means that this personal identity will go on in the next life. You remember how the scars on our Lord's body were still there after his Resurrection. That was to show us. Perhaps in thousands of years time we shall have such spiritual mastery over our bodies that they will not die as they do now, but just be transmuted into spiritual bodies. It may be. As we are at present, our natural bodies have to die before we can have spiritual bodies.

Our bodies then here are our means of expression, and our spirits have built them up. In the glorified life beyond, our spirits will be able to build up far better means of expression; and we shall be still ourselves, only far stronger, more beautiful and refined. Wonderful beyond words though the natural body is, the spiritual body will be more wonderful.

90

THE LIFE EVERLASTING

I.—Life Eternal

THERE is a very wise principle, "Men are generally right when they affirm, and wrong when they deny [*F. D. Maurice's principle in especial*]. The Creed is a great affirmation, and it avoids negative ideas: thus it says nothing about death or damnation, but ends with the assertion of eternal life. We know that there must be a Judgement, though perhaps the Judgement is already taking place, and may continue for thousands of years: because Judgement means justice—the setting everything right, the restoration of all things and people to the place for which they are most fitted, the establishment of the divine order everywhere. We feel sure that wilful sin is a horrible thing: some there are to whom evil becomes good, and good evil; they seem incapable of repentance. We can hardly imagine a future for them; but still it is not for us to condemn or to deny. We can only leave all such problems in the strong hands of God, knowing very well that our judgements of others are imperfect and erroneous. We content ourselves with saying that we believe in the life eternal.

It seems that most people, when their bodies die, pass into a much better state, but that this is an intermediate state—a sort of ante-room—through which the spirits journey till they reach the higher heavens and are able to enjoy completely the life of the world to come.

In the Nicene Creed, the Eucharistic Creed, these are the words used, "the life of the world to come." In the Apostles' Creed the words are "life eternal" [*vitam aeternam*, *ζωὴν αἰώνιον*], which are translated "life

everlasting." *Eternal* is a stronger and profounder word than *everlasting*, which only means of course "lasting for ever." Eternal means that which is above time altogether, that which belongs to heaven, where a thousand years are but as yesterday. We may almost say that eternal means spiritual. Eternal life is the life of the spirit. Time and eternity have always been difficult problems for philosophers, and you could not understand the modern theories. [*Bergson's clock-time and succession, Einstein's space-time and the fourth dimension—his theory that phenomena are a blend of space, time, and matter, a trinity comprised in one actual reality—will warn T. not to be too facile in speaking of these subjects.*] So we will be quite simple, and say that eternal life is the life of heaven, which is above time altogether, and is therefore (among other things) everlasting.

Eternal life is the life of the spirit; and for the good man it is already begun, here and now, and will go on increasing in the next world.

II.—In the World to come

The eternal life will be perfectly realised in the life of the world to come. To this we all look forward, and with this we conclude our profession of belief, adding *Amen*, "Verily," "So it is."

We cannot describe the glory of heaven, we cannot even imagine it. An old poet, Francis Quarles [†1644], put this very cleverly:

> But wouldst thou know what's heaven? I'll tell thee what:
> Think what thou canst not think, and heaven is that.

Christopher Columbus was very badly treated by the King and Queen of Spain, Ferdinand and Isabella, and was brought back from his second journey to America in fetters [*he discovered America in* 1492, *the second voyage was in* 1498]: he preserved the fetters ever after as a memorial of the King's ingratitude. After many disappointments, he died, 1506, in neglect and poverty; and when he lay dying, he said, "I shall sail forth on our

last voyage, where I shall not meet with disappointment." We shall not be disappointed! "When I awake up after thy likeness," says the Psalmist [17^{16}] "I shall be satisfied with it." And S. Paul could only quote from the old prophet [*Is.* 64^4] when he said [1 *Co.* 2^9]: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him."

III.—This Life

Yet we do not spend our time dreaming of the life of the world to come. Our duty is to begin the eternal life now, and to make a little heaven around us here. That was the way of our Lord, who said little about heaven, and did not describe the next world, but gave men, as they came to him, eternal life; "and this is life eternal," comments S. John [17^3], "that they should know thee, the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ."

Here is that higher life, ready for us to begin now, a strenuous life, as Matthew Arnold says in his sonnet on Immortality:

> Foiled by our fellow-men, depressed, outworn,
> We leave the brutal world to take its way,
> And, *Patience! in another life*, we say,
> *The world shall be thrust down, and we upborne.*
> And will not, then, the immortal armies scorn
> The world's poor, routed leavings? or will they,
> Who failed under the heat of this life's day,
> Support the fervours of the heavenly morn?
>
> No, no! the energy of life may be
> Kept on after the grave, but not begun,
> And he who flagged not in the earthly strife,
> From strength to strength advancing—only he
> His soul well-knit, and all his battles won,
> Mounts, and that hardly, to eternal life.

I remember a true story [*Baron von Hugel, "Essays and Addresses,* 142] of a young lieutenant in the Boer War. A troop of cavalry was fired at from an ambush, and the sergeant was hit and slid off his horse. The

young lieutenant, a boy fresh from Eton, with riches and all the nice things of life to enjoy, jumped down, clasped the wounded man, and shielded him with his body. Then he too was hit; a gush of blood fell over the old sergeant, who saw that his young rescuer was dying. "O how sad!" the sergeant said, "you just starting a brilliant life, while I am getting old, and of no importance." The young soldier turned on him a beaming countenance—"Sad!" he said, "What could be better?" and he fell back dead.

Death is not to be feared. It is this life that is dangerous and difficult. We should always be cheerful about death, and avoid all blackness and gloom, which are pagan things for those who sorrow without hope. When the hour strikes, the angel of death comes, "Very gently—very tenderly, if we will but have it so—folds the tired hands together, takes the way-worn feet in his broad strong palm; and lifting us in his wonderful arms, he bears us swiftly down the valley and across the waters of Remembrance" [*from Michael Fairless. Let us keep to beautiful images and phrases here.*] Death brings the reward, life is the struggle that makes us worthy of it; and the striving of life is not for ourselves but for others also—for the coming of the Kingdom of God—

> When see? When there dawns a day,
> If not on the homely earth,
> Then yonder, world's away,
> Where the strange and new have birth,
> And Power comes full in play. (*Browning, Asolando.*)

IV.—Thy Kingdom Come

We do not know how far eternal life may be brought onto this earth. We know that we enter upon it here and now: "I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it abundantly" [*Jn.* 10^{10}], and we know that we can bring the kingdom of Heaven more and more upon the earth, because we are told to ask for this in the Lord's Prayer. Life of a far higher kind than any we know at present is attainable on this planet, and the human race may develop into a race as glorious

as the angels; when death and sin will be conquered in this world as in the next. Such a future depends upon ourselves, and for this reform of man and of all human society we are bidden to work, spreading peace and happiness, and health of mind and body, wherever we go, as Jesus did, and bringing heaven upon earth. So it is that the great passage from S. Paul, with which we bury the bodies of our friends [1 *Co.* 15[58]] ends with the appeal to work:—"Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not vain in the Lord."

Still, neither an eternal life already achieved here below, nor an eternal life to be begun and known solely in the beyond can be sufficient, but a life begun and known in part here, and fully to be achieved and understood hereafter [*Hügel, "Eternal Life,"* 396]. And this life depends absolutely upon God: so Emily Brontë addresses her great poem to God, the Eternal:

> Though earth and man were gone,
> And suns and universes ceased to be,
> And thou wert left alone,
> Every existence would exist in thee.
>
> There is not room for death,
> Nor atom that his might could render void:
> Thou—*thou* art Being and Breath,
> And what thou art can never be destroyed.

Note: A Summary

The Teacher may have time to end this Lesson with a brief summary, or he may prefer after a revision of each part of the Creed to conclude with a general revision on the Holy Trinity [L. 37], *and perhaps with the line of thought given by Ruskin in the extract which follows from his "Lectures on Art,"* 147–9. *The Summary of the Creed in the Church Catechism is unsatisfactory, since it emphasises instead of correcting the tritheism which may result from a careless reading of the two Creeds, if not corrected by the Athanasian Canticle—wherein indeed lies*

the great value of that unpopular profession of faith. Although Catholic Christianity has always professed the unity of God, tritheism has also been latent in much supposedly orthodox theology. If the Summary is dealt with at all, this must be guarded against, and it must also be explained that "the elect people of God" means to us, not those predestinated to salvation, but those chosen to do special work for God.

The purpose of religion is to give us eternal life, to help us to know God whom to know is eternal life. The Creed tell us, in simple language which it is not easy to improve, what the whole Church, universal, catholic, believes about the One God who is manifested to us in the Holy Trinity. God created us, and still creates; God redeemed us, that is, he rescued us from slavery and made us free, and still redeems us; and God sanctifies us and inspires all good things, more especially he sanctifies those whom he chooses to do his work in the world.

We end our choir services with S. Paul's simple and beautiful benediction, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore." I am going to conclude by asking —— to read you some noble words of John Ruskin on this Grace:

"Now I do not know precisely what sense is attached in the English public mind to these expressions. But what I have to tell you positively is that the three things do actually exist, and can be known if you care to know them, and possessed if you care to possess them. . . .

"First, by simply obeying the orders of the Founder of your religion, all grace, graciousness, or beauty and favour of gentle life, will be given to you in mind and body, in work and in rest. The Grace of Christ exists, and can be had if you will. Secondly, as you know more and more of the created world, you will find that the true will of its Maker is that its creatures should be happy: that he has made everything beautiful in its time and its place, and that it is chiefly by the fault of men, when they are allowed the liberty of thwarting his

laws, that Creation groans or travails in pain. The Love of God exists, and you may see it, and live in it if you will. Lastly, a Spirit does actually exist which teaches the ant her path, the bird her building, and men, in an instinctive and marvellous way, whatever lovely arts and noble deeds are possible to them. Without it you can do no good thing. To the grief of it you can do many bad ones. In the possession of it is your peace and your power. . . .

"I pray you with all earnestness to prove, and know within your hearts, that all things lovely and righteous are possible for those who believe in their possibility, and who determine that for their part, they will make every day's work contribute to them. Let every dawn of morning be to you as the beginning of life, and every setting sun be to you as its close: then let every one of these short lives leave its sure record of some kindly thing done for others—some goodly strength or knowledge gained for yourselves; so, from day to day, and strength to strength, you shall build up indeed, by Art, by Thought, and by Just Will, an Ecclesia of England, of which it shall not be said, 'See what manner of stones are here,' but, 'See what manner of men.' "

PRINTED BY W. HEFFER & SONS LTD., CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.